

Format for ANSWERING REVIEWERS

October 29, 2014



Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: **12910-review.doc**).

Title: The Effect of Supervised Exercise on Aerobic Capacity on Aerobic Capacity in Cancer Survivors: Adherence and Workload Predict Variance in Effect.

Author: Beaudry R, Kruger C, Liang Y, Parliament M, Haykowsky M, McNeely ML.

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Meta-Analysis*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 12910

We would like to thank the reviewer for the feedback and recommended revisions. We feel that these suggestions have greatly improved the quality of the manuscript. We have highlighted the changes in the text to facilitate review of the manuscript.

1 Format has been updated as requested.

2 Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewer

1. Revision made as suggested; sentence rephrased as well as references added for studies published since the 2012 Jones meta-analysis.
2. Revision made; QoL added as an outcome secondary to aerobic capacity. QoL data was extracted from included studies but was not part of the study selection criteria.
3. The analyses were multivariable.
4. Revision made as suggested.
5. Kappa+p value: this has been added to the text Kappa 0.9; $p < 0.001$ (highlight Page 8)
6. Revision made as suggested; 13 studies, 14 comparisons, typographical error.
7. Risk of bias paragraph relocated as suggested.
8. Paragraph reordered to match table 3. Section was not broken into subsections; we believe table 3 presents summary of this data most effectively and that this section reads better as one paragraph.
9. Revision considered but not made; moving quality of life data to follow aerobic capacity results breaks apart the sections pertaining to aerobic capacity findings (subgroup analysis and meta regression of VO₂ data). QoL is a secondary outcome measure for the review. As QoL was measured using a number of different assessments, these results were pooled to explore the possibility that improvements in aerobic capacity are linked to improvements in QoL. Our analysis did not show a significant effect of exercise on quality of life overall. We support this by showing how using only the FACT-G assessment demonstrates a positive relationship between QoL and aerobic capacity. We contend that it is important to include so that results are not interpreted as there being no evidence to support improvements in aerobic capacity showing benefits in QoL but that heterogeneity as a result of different scales needs to be further explored.
10. Revision made, comparison to previous findings in the Jones meta included.
11. Paragraph relocated.
12. Paragraph relocated;
We would like to clarify only 2 variables were used in the meta regression; workload

(intensity-minutes) and attendance. We appreciate that there may have been some confusion as the workload variable was calculated from the duration of the study (weeks), number of days per week, duration of each session and factored by the intensity. As there was considerable heterogeneity in these prescription variables of duration, days per week and duration of exercise per session, we felt that this calculation better reflected how much time subjects actually spent exercising.

13. Paragraph relocated.

14. Paragraph relocated.

15. Paragraph relocated.

16. Paragraph relocated but discussion of QoL not changed. As discussed in revision 9 we believe it is important to state our negative result, but not overstate the finding.

17. We believe it is important to report a risk of bias summary to give an indication of study quality. As well, we have included a table with quality of life data, as suggested.

18. See revision 12, only two variables were used in the meta regression due to the low number of studies available for analysis.

3 References and typesetting were corrected

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the *World Journal of Meta-Analysis*.

Sincerely yours,

Rhys Beaudry

Margaret McNeely