

Response to Reviewers

Responses and Changes Made to the Manuscript are **in bold**.

We made an attempt to state page, paragraph or line locations accurately for the resubmitted edition.

Reviewer # 1

1. The author asserts that Werley "influenced the nursing profession to accept its professional responsibility as a key provider in disaster management and partner in interdisciplinary research." (abstract) and later (page 18) that "the entire nursing profession became involved in mass disaster preparation."

We have modified the language in both the abstract and p. 18 (now p. 20 line 6).

2. Disaster management ends up the responsibility of the American Red Cross. What does this mean - for nursing, for the role of the professions, for the role of the military? Where were the points of resistance to Werley's agenda? Were they reasonable (what was / is the fundamental purpose of nursing education)? Was it the inertia that accompanies the receding of an imminent threat? How might these tensions be replaying themselves today?

We think responding to these questions will add significantly to the length of the manuscript as they are not simple to answer. We have added content in a number of places about the timing of the threats or wars that had an impact on her work. The only major resistance to Werley's agenda was from the physicians and nurses who didn't understand how nursing research could add to WRAIR. A discussion of this issue would require bringing in the gender issues of that time period; we lack adequate room to discuss that thoroughly.

3. ...the author accepts without question (quoting from Werley's 1988 memoirs) that she was torn between accepting the position and asking that it be filled with a doctorally prepared nurse (page 5). Should this be accepted at face value? Werley had to be a confident and ambitious nurse to succeed as she did, and the issue of finding a doctorally prepared nurse in 1955 is very, very slim. Did she later receive criticism for not having a doctoral degree?

We added additional sentences on p. 6, lines 13-14 to clarify the status of doctoral preparation at the time and the support that Werley received to accept the position. She was not criticized, as few others had a doctorate, as the reviewer has implied. Werley did pursue the doctorate immediately upon retirement from the Army a few years later.

4. I'd also like to know more about Werley. How did she get into the positions she did (not just that she did)? What was she like?

We would love to discuss Werley in more depth. However, it has been a challenge to meet NR page limitations with what we have to say in this manuscript. Our intent is to write additional manuscripts about her illustrious career.

5. I'd also like to see this work more solidly grounded in the secondary literature - beyond that of just the Army Nurse Corps. John Gaddis' studies of Cold War America, for example, can help a reader get a real feel for the terror many Americans felt and the responsibility of the military to prepare for possibly imminent nuclear war.

We have added to page 4 paragraph 1 and page 7, last paragraph that continues on to p. 8.

There are some other technical details that the author may want to consider:

1. There is a heavy dependence of passive voice which leaves the reader without a sense of who is doing what. See, for example: page 4 lines 9-10: who is initiating the courses?

These particular lines have been changed and the entire manuscript was reviewed and sentences rewritten.

2. The author argues that Werley was a pioneer in military interdisciplinary research; but also (page 4) mentions 2 nurses working on research teams. Also how does Werley (and the author) conceptualize interdisciplinary research: being part of another's research project? And what happens to Werley's proposal for research on nursing functions (page 17)?

The 2 nurses are mentioned to show the attempt to represent different disciplines on the committee. Most likely these nurses gathered data (urine specimens?) for medical projects on their units, a common practice in those days. Werley viewed interdisciplinary research as different disciplines working together on a project. However, with the state of affairs at this time, interdisciplinary would have would have involved working on another's project. We were unable to find evidence of the outcome of that proposal and have addressed that on p. 17 (now p.18, lines 13-15)

3. There needs to be better documentation of materials. For example, where is the data on page 7 coming from?

We have reviewed the manuscript for the need for citations and have added any that were missing. A reference was added on p. 7 (now, p.8).

4. Joseph Goldstein keeps appearing with Werely in published articles and presentations? Who is he? What is his importance to Werley's work?

We have added to p.9 , 3rd paragraph, describing who and what he did.

5. Page 9 -14: the author moves back and forth between historical data and connections to present issues. This is methodologically problematic.

We have tried to clarify any confusion here. We are attempting to report the historical data and relate its significance to the present situation.

6. What exactly did Werely think of nurses' role in Operation Plumbob (page 16)?
Werley was very proud of the role nurses played in the research. We have added a sentence and a reference to p. 16 (now p. 17, end of 2nd paragraph).

Reviewer # 2

1. I would suggest that the author think about adding some secondary historical studies that cover the history of the cold war years and the nation's response to the fear and trepidation gripping the country at the possibility of a nuclear attack.

This suggestion duplicates Reviewer #1's, 5th paragraph above. Please see the response listed there.

2. First, the author must address the lack of names of the key people referred to in the narrative. For example on page 4 and 5 the Commandant of WRAIR is mentioned but no name is given. On page 5, in the last paragraph, neither the head of the Army graduate school nor the Surgeon General are identified by name.

Names have been added on page 5- paragraphs 1, 2, 3, and page 6, para 1 (pages have shifted: 4-5 is now 5-6).

3. The author also needs to do a better job in footnoting information. For example, on page 7, a 1956 Department of Atomic Casualties Studies history is cited but there in no footnote listed.

The footnote was added to the end of the first sentence under "Preparing to Care for Mass Casualties" on p. 7 and the reference titled clarified on page 21 (6th entry).

4. The manuscript would also benefit from adding some historical explanatory footnotes. For example on page 17 the author refers to the Army School of Nursing but does not provide any background information as to why it was opened and closed.

Additional information was added near lines 6 and 7 under “A Nursing Department at WRAIR” now near the top of p. 19. The authors are familiar with explanatory footnotes. We tried not to use them because they add length to the paper, giving us a false impression of just how long our paper is. We have chosen to add content to the body of the paper.

5. Also, on page 14, I believe the author has confused some information. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare was part of the Public Health Service, not the other way around.

The Public Health Service was/is administered by the Dep’t. of Health, Education and Welfare (now DHHS). We verified this; see *National Health Policy Forum, The Basics The Public Health Service, History* available at http://www.nhpf.org/pdfs_basics/basics_PHS.pdf. Therefore we did not change it.

6. Finally, I believe the manuscript would benefit from editing before it is re-submitted.
We have very carefully read and edited the entire paper and reference list.

CHECKLIST FOR STYLE --

Title Page

? Supply complete address for corresponding author. **We have done this.**

Abstract

Provide a structured abstract, if possible. **We have revised the abstract to meet the requirements.**

References:

Check publication date for Flanagan ref/cit. **1976, corrected on p.13, line 14.**

Check publication date for Piemonte (1987 or 1988). **1987, corrected on page 17, line 8.**

The following references are not cited in the text. Remove from reference list or add to text: Walter Reed Med. Ctr (1955). **Removed from References, page 24.**

Bryant 1955. **Is cited, page 6, last line.**

Other:

Is Project Proposal... included in text? **No, removed from References, page 23.**

Include author for Nat. League article in Nursing Outlook. **There was no author identified, it was in the News section. Reference format reflects APA style for no author.**

Include author for Service Stripe article (1955) in text & ref. list. **There was no author identified. It was a newspaper article. Reference format reflects APA style for no author.**