

April 26, 2007

Molly C. Dougherty PhD, RN
Editor, Nursing Research

RE: Responses to Final Questions for NRES-D-00009R1 "Psychiatric disorders in patients presenting to the Emergency Department for Minor Injury."

Dear Dr. Dougherty,

I am pleased that you have accepted this manuscript. I am responding to the three minor items that you raise in the acceptance letter.

1. "Please check for accuracy of the information on the 1st paragraph. I am most concerned with sentence #2 (Ten percent of US residents were treated...). If the information in sentence #2 is accurate, then sentence #4 (...injury risk is so high that 'most persons sustain a...') seems low.

Below is the direct quote paragraph from MMWR to support the statement in sentence 2. These data come from the NEISS system which is a national probability sample of ED's - providing a way for the CDC to infer the total number of cases treated in the country's EDs.

"The findings in this report indicate that, in 2000, approximately 10% of U.S. residents were treated for nonfatal injuries in EDs. On the basis of NEISS-AIP and National Vital Statistics System data (7), for every injury-related death in the United States, approximately 200 persons were treated for nonfatal injuries in EDs. Most (93.6%) of these injuries were unintentional; however, approximately 2 million persons were treated for violence-related injuries. NEISS-AIP will provide a national data source for further characterizing these injuries by unintentional and violence-related causes and helping to identify those at risk."

The sentence #4 _ indicating that most persons sustain a significant injury in their lives is not contrary to the second sentence and is not low. Overall, it is estimated from NEISS and NVSS that 39,000,000 injuries or poisonings. Assuming 29 million (after removing poisonings) - ~146,400 die, 1,324,400 are hospitalized and the remainder (>27,000,000) are treated and released. I believe the problem is moving from all injury to 'significant injury'. Injury scientists will understand this intuitively, but nurse scientists who do not know the field may well have the same question that you pose. Therefore, I have removed the sentence #4 - as I believe that nothing substantial is lost from its removal.

2. Paragraph 6 - briefly define the Axis I & II when first introduced.
We have done so.

3. In the final paragraph make the statement 'a significant portion' more specific.
We have done so.

As requested I have queried my co-authors as to their approval to post the original submission along with the initial peer review. I have asked them to respond directly to Sherry. I agree it was a balanced review and would support this posting - however, I would suggest it is important to include my letter responding to the review, as this is also an important mechanism by which authors can explain any disagreements with the review and why they chose to take or not take action.

Sincerely,

Therese S. Richmond PhD, CRNP, FAAN
Associate Professor, School of Nursing
University of Pennsylvania