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Reviewer's report:

Review of article

Summary

This is an interesting article that addresses an under-researched area. It is clear that it builds on other work done by the authors in this area. The article provides useful information and findings relevant for teams and health care professionals working in the field of stroke rehabilitation and community settings.

Thank you for asking me to review this manuscript. I hope my comments will be useful.

Major Compulsory revisions:

Background:

1. This has a clear structure and puts the study into context. While it gives a clear overview of the local need and context, a more thorough overview of the research that has or hasn't been done in regards to outdoor mobility, training, and community stroke rehabilitation and the problems with their implementation should be included in this section.

Methods:

2. The type of methodology used and methodological paradigm should be made explicit at the start of this section. Later, reference is made to grounded theory, but it is not clear whether this study is using a grounded theory approach. If it is, the research aim and the findings will need to be consistent with the production and development of theory.

3. Reference to the ethical approval in the methods section rather than in the data analysis section (bottom of page 8) would be more appropriate.

4. The authors should explain the recruitment procedure, the process of acquiring informed consent and the sampling method used.

Data analysis:

5. The process is documented clearly. However, also in this section, reference is made to constant comparison and grounded theory which is confusing. As previously mentioned, the aim of the study does not appear to align with grounded theory and the approach adopted needs to be explained and justified more explicitly. If the study was using a grounded theory approach I would expect the methods and data analysis to include reference to saturation, axial
and selective coding, model development, and memo writing for example.

Results:

6. The results present interesting, well organised information that address the aim of the study. Quotes are used to good effect to support the domains or categories. I did find this section unnecessarily long. The results need to be revised to provide the information in a more succinct and user friendly manner. For example:

You should consider presenting the domains and categories figuratively or in a table format at the start of the section. This would provide a clearer framework for the information that follows.

The use of more than one quote was not necessary throughout (i.e. p12). In addition, the explanations provided, as well as the inclusion of quotes, did not always offer anything additional to the reader.

7. Page 10: influences from people with stroke section. I found that the wording in this section meant that it did not clearly present the findings as reportings or perceptions of the therapists. I think it is important to make this distinction. The people with stroke may have had very different perceptions about what they wanted from their therapists and what was influencing why they may or may not have wanted to practice outdoor walking or travel.

8. Page 14: It is really useful to have the summary at the end of the first section. In this summary paragraph you also mention health professionals’ attitudes which required further explanation.

9. Page 28 and 30: sections 6 and 7: both use the same subheading. This is confusing and the distinction between the two sections needs to be made clear.

Discussion:

10. The discussion focused on some key areas: the impact of the client and family values and knowing and applying EBP and revision of roles to address resource barriers. However, the actual findings of the study, linked to the aims: the identification of barriers and enablers to delivering the intervention, were insufficiently discussed: i.e. knowledge and skills, memory and attention, organisational policies, professionals beliefs and roles, and resources. This meant that the article did not feel cohesive or consistent in its aim or message. Other sections such as “maintaining the fidelity of the original intervention” (page 36) did not feel as relevant to the aim of the paper. It may be helpful to include this latter section, but not at the expense of discussing the key findings.

Contribution to knowledge:

11. Second sentence. This sentence is misleading and inaccurate. The study was a qualitative research study that asked therapists what they thought the enablers and barriers for implementing the outdoor journey intervention were. As such they are perceptions.

12. Final sentence: Although it is pertinent to make reference to the use of the Michie et al framework in the qualitative analysis, discussion on the negatives and limitations of doing so are needed to provide a more critical overview.
13. Implications for practice and research: this section needs to be expanded to ensure that it is clearly linked with the findings of the research. At the moment it refers to three or four key suggestions, all with merit, but not a comprehensive overview of the enablers and barriers elicited from this study and their clinical implications.

Discretionary revisions;
1. Background: Page 4 final paragraph: sentence 2 and 3: the wording is not clear. How can evidence be delivered? And what is meant by sentinel?
2. Aims of the study (p5). You should consider rephrasing the aim to be clear that this is about therapist’s experiences and perceptions of the barriers and enablers.
3. Methods:
The authors provide clear, comprehensive and useful information regarding the two teams in this section. This provides useful information about the teams’ context for the reader, and will help with the applicability of the findings to other teams and other settings. I wonder whether including the participant and demographic information in this section might be more relevant to the heading “The Sample”. Information regarding the level of experience of participants may also add to the demographic data presented in Table 1.

Data Collection:
4. Clear and succinct. I would have found it helpful to have a brief overview of what the half-day training workshop included, as this may have impacted on the findings and the second, follow up interviews.
5. Did the researcher undertake any reflective accounts or bracketing within the data collection process?

Data analysis:
6. Could you explain whether consensus was reached and how?
7. You should also consider explaining and justifying the use of conceptual domains within the data analysis process, rather than other forms of open coding and organisation of the data.

Results:
8. Page 9: I thought it was unnecessary to use percentages, particularly as the population was small.
9. Page 14: I found the use of the term “major” a little misleading due to the type of research being undertaken, and as it suggests a quantifiable, measurable factor or nature to the study.
10. Page 16: second paragraph: “While the interview challenged...”. This sentence seems a little assumptive. I presume the interview was not challenging the participants’ practice, but in fact asking them to describe what they did and why? I think it is very clear and relevant in the following section to explain how the impact of time and participating in the research and the training, has
encouraged some of the participants to reflect on, and change their practice.  

11. Page 38. Study limitations: these should be expanded to consider bias and issues such as trustworthiness and rigour, respondent validation for example.
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