

## Author's response to reviews

**Title:** Do self-reported intentions predict clinicians behaviour: a systematic review.

### Authors:

Martin P Eccles ([martin.eccles@ncl.ac.uk](mailto:martin.eccles@ncl.ac.uk))  
Susan Hrisos ([susan.hrisos@ncl.ac.uk](mailto:susan.hrisos@ncl.ac.uk))  
Jill Francis ([j.francis@abdn.ac.uk](mailto:j.francis@abdn.ac.uk))  
Eileen F Kaner ([e.f.s.kaner@ncl.ac.uk](mailto:e.f.s.kaner@ncl.ac.uk))  
Heather O Dickinson ([heather.dickinson@ncl.ac.uk](mailto:heather.dickinson@ncl.ac.uk))  
Fiona Beyer ([fiona.beyer@ncl.ac.uk](mailto:fiona.beyer@ncl.ac.uk))  
Marie Johnston ([m.johnston@abdn.ac.uk](mailto:m.johnston@abdn.ac.uk))

**Version:** 2 **Date:** 31 July 2006

### Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editor

Thank you for considering a revised version of our manuscript: "Do self-reported intentions predict clinicians' behaviour: a systematic review." for publication in Implementation Science. We would also like to thank the reviewers for their very positive and constructive comments on this manuscript.

We have considered all of the reviewer's comments and suggestions and have revised the manuscript accordingly. A detailed response to the specific concerns raised by the reviewers is incorporated below.

Reviewer 1

Discretionary Revision:

The small number of studies might preclude the type of analysis I have in mind so I offer the following only as a suggestion. I wondered if it would be worthwhile to conduct a weighted least squares regression analysis (controlling for sample size) with effect sizes as the dependent variable and type of measure (0 = self-report, 1 = objective), correspondence, % analysed, and other relevant methodological or study characteristics as the independent variables in order to determine the simultaneous impact of these different moderator variables on intention-behaviour consistency.

Author response:

Whilst we agree with the reviewer's suggestion we also agree with their observation of the appropriateness of the proposed analysis in the light of the small number of studies. We have not proceeded with the suggested analysis to explore moderators of the intention/behaviour relationship as we do not feel this would be a robust analysis for the data we have. It is very unlikely that 10 studies can provide meaningful information on how the outcome varies with all these variables at the same time. However, we have addressed this in the discussion section of the amended manuscript.

Reviewer 2

## Comment

The background literature relating to behavioural intentions is given limited coverage, with several key meta-analyses of the utility of the TPB that speak to the utility of intention omitted (e.g. Conner & Armitage, 1998; Godin & Kok, 1996; Hausenblas, Carron, & Mack, 1997). Their inclusion would highlight the variability in the utility of the construct that has been long acknowledged (e.g. Madden, Ellen & Ajzen, 1992). The further omission of any mention of the intention-behaviour gap misses the opportunity to ground discussion the professional constraints (moderators of cognition - behaviour relationships in this context) in the related literature (e.g. Cooke & Sheeran, 2004; Sheeran & Abraham, 2003).

## Discretionary Revision

Evidence of variability of utility of intention in predicting behaviour, and known moderators of its utility should be covered.

## Author response

A brief overview of this literature and its implications has been included in the introduction of the manuscript. Given the target audience, this is intended to highlight and reference the important issues to the reader.

## Comment

Inter-rater agreement on inclusion or intention - behaviour correspondence was not reported overall or by study.

## Minor Essential Revision:

Summarise inter-rater agreement on inclusion.

## Discretionary Revision:

Report inter-rater agreement by trial.

## Author response:

A description of rater agreement has been added to the section of text in the results section relating to the description of included studies.

## Minor Essential Revision:

Intention should be explicitly defined.

Author response:

A definition of intention has been added to the introduction section.

General comment:

It is left to the reader to summarise by rated correspondence between intention and behaviour measures from the tables, despite being acknowledged as a key step in using theory, and this correspondence being a main theme in the discussion

Discretionary Revision:

Report inter-rater agreement on intention - behaviour correspondence overall and by trial.

Author response:

A description of inter-rater agreement on intention - behaviour correspondence overall and by trial has been added to the text of the results section relating to study quality.

Discretionary Revision:

Compare intention - behaviour correlations between studies with good, unclear, and poor intention - behaviour correspondence in the results section

Author response:

A description of these correlations by correspondence level has been included in the results section as suggested.

General comment:

The data abstraction process is not detailed, and it is unclear whether the 4 authors who were identified as being involved duplicated the process independently.

Author response:

The text has been modified to clarify the data abstraction process.

Yours faithfully

Susan Hrisos