
1. Exercise science tests basic principles that it assumes (or at least hopes) are universal in the field. For an applied subdiscipline such as physical activity and cancer survivorship to emerge, it needs to make the case for its uniqueness. According to the proposed framework, what are the four primary propositions that can be tested to demonstrate the uniqueness and necessity of a field such as physical activity and cancer survivorship?

2. What is the difference between an “implied” moderator and a “tested” moderator? Are “tested” moderators necessary to make the case for the importance of cancer variables in moderating the exercise response or its determinants?

3. How would you design a study to determine if a cancer variable moderates an exercise outcome?

4. Are you convinced that physical activity and cancer survivorship is a viable field of study? Why or why not?

5. If you are not in the cancer field, what are the unique variables in your field of study? Create a table similar to Table 1 in the article for your own unique set of variables.

6. What are the most important unique variables in your field? Does the importance of the variable depend on which of the four propositions is being tested?

7. Has your field examined its main unique variables in each of the four propositions? Propose a novel study to examine one of your unique variables for one of the four propositions.

8. Has your field implied or tested its unique variables as moderators of exercise outcomes and determinants?

9. How could your field of study make a compelling case for its uniqueness? Propose a study that makes the most compelling case for the uniqueness of your field?