

November 11, 2005

**Re: #2005/107: Research on the frontlines of healthcare – A cooperative learning approach**

Dear Dr. Jones and Dr. Bakken,

Thank you for accepting our paper, along with the opportunity to make final revisions to improve manuscript #2005/107 – **Research on the frontlines of healthcare – A cooperative learning approach**. The document is attached, and this letter outlines how we addressed your comments:

1. Opening heading: Pronouns throughout could be minimized for a research paper.
  - *We have replaced over 25 pronouns throughout the paper.*
2. Page 4, Organization: If the first paragraph should be the one at the bottom of the page under the Heading. Just move that to an Introduction; then have organizational context and Project Goal.
  - *This was done exactly as suggested.*
3. Page 5, Insert Background literature or the heading from page 4 “Cooperative Learning Approaches” and start with the first paragraph.
  - *This was done exactly as recommended.*
4. Historically...Avoid the last single sentence paragraph on page 6 under this discussion.
  - *Discussion concepts and sentences were added.*
5. Page 8 seems out of sync...Literature Review ...of what? It seems it was a part of team building and should be integrated as a strategy of that process.
  - *This was integrated into the process, as suggested.*
6. Page 17, Summary or implications should be called out as a separate heading with more than a one sentence statement.
  - *These were separated and additional information was added*

7. Figure 1 and 2 need titles.
  - *We were unsure what was meant by this. The titles appear to be there. We did, however, reword the titles to better describe the content of those figures.*
8. Page 15, paragraph one belongs in methods; results in Table 3 should be briefly summarized and pointed to from the text.
  - *This was done exactly as recommended.*
9. Page 15, last paragraph - any internal consistency reliability coefficients for each factor?
  - *This had been done and this information was added to the paper.*
10. Page 16, discussion, paragraph 1, be more specific about what kind of research methods.
  - *We have added specific statements about the details of the research methods indicated.*
11. Page 16, last paragraph, one of the specified limitations is that the authors state that they did not address construct validity. This is an error. Factor analysis, which was conducted, is a method for addressing construct validity.
  - *Thank you for pointing out this error – this has been corrected and that statement deleted.*

We hope this addresses all of your concerns and appreciate your suggestions. As you review the final manuscript, please feel free to contact us with any questions or clarifications.

Thank you again for your time, the thorough review and your suggestions.

Best regards,

Joanna Bokovoy  
610.402.1813