

April 18, 2006

Dr. Mahon,

I am responding to your e-mail to Sherry Handfinger pasted below.

I do not think that p values are 0. They may be  $< .0001$ , but not 0. I understand the comments you are making below, but think that we need to have better information on this to go forward. I request that you consult a statistician about this and report back and meanwhile, we will send your manuscript to one of our statistician reviewers and ask him/her to look at Tables 1 and 2 and provide an assessment.

This may delay sending your manuscript to the publisher, but it is an important point.

Thanks.

Molly (Mickey) Dougherty, PhD, RN  
Professor of Nursing,  
Editor, Nursing Research <http://www.nursing-research-editor.com>  
CB#7460  
University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-7460  
Telephone 919 966-9129  
Fax 919 966-9736  
email [m\\_dougherty@unc.edu](mailto:m_dougherty@unc.edu)

\*\*\*\*\*

----- Original Message -----

**From:** To: [handfing@email.unc.edu](mailto:handfing@email.unc.edu)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 05, 2006 11:38 AM  
**Subject:** Re: Acceptance of ms #2005/183 -- please confirm receipt

**Hi Sherry,**

Dr. Dougherty wanted us to convert the 0s and 1s on Tables 1 and 2 to standard p values. However, we cannot do this. These were the values that were generated by the computer program we used by Mullen. His book does not provide any information on how to translate the 0 and 1 values to standard p values. We have tried to contact Dr. Mullen with questions about the program in the past, with no response from him. At present, we have contacted others who have used the program about the above issue; we have not received any response. All things considered, we believe we are obliged to leave the 0 and 1 one-tailed p values on Tables 1 and 2. Please convey this information to Dr. Dougherty.

Thank you.

Noreen Mahon and co-authors