

September 30, 2005

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

Dear Dr. Jones and Dr. Bakken,

Thank you for the opportunity to revise and improve our manuscript #2005/107 – Research on the frontlines of healthcare – A cooperative learning approach. We have attached the revised document, and this letter outlines how we addressed the issues raised by each of the reviewers.

All reviewers commented on the organization and structure of the original manuscript. In the correspondence from guest editors Dr. Jones and Dr. Bakken, they offered structural recommendations regarding the overall flow of the manuscript. They also provided revised headings, intended to replace what was originally used in the manuscript. Using these headings as a starting point, listed below are the detailed changes made in our revised manuscript:

Recommended Revisions from Editors Dr. Jones and Dr. Bakken

- All headings were replaced with the following headings:
 - a. Organizational Context
 - b. Cooperative Learning Approach
 - c. Preliminary Work – Introduction to Cooperative Learning (with subheadings: Team Building, Literature Review, Preliminary Study #1: Growing Organizational Capacity, and Preliminary Study #2: The ED Touch-Time Study)
 - d. Research Question for the Main Study
 - e. Methods (with subheadings: Overall design, Methods: Waiting room structure, Methods: Survey including development of survey, and Methods: Observations)
 - f. Data Analysis
 - g. Results
 - h. Discussion

Recommended Revisions from Reviewer #1

- Reviewer #1's comments focused on re-organization and offered specific recommendations on restructuring certain sentences and concepts throughout the manuscript. Many of these issues were addressed and resolved using the restructuring proposed by editors Drs. Jones and Bakken (see above).
- Comment 1a: suggested that the problem statement be moved up front (towards the beginning of the manuscript). We addressed this request by moving the problem statement (research question) to the end of the first section – Organizational Context.

- Comment 1a: suggested a revised problem statement – “use a combination of methods including EBP to identify the primary dissatisfiers in an ED.” We did not revise the problem statement to reflect this suggestion, because once we restructured the manuscript content, we felt that our problem statement became much clearer.
- Comment 1b: requested more information about team participants. This information was added to the Team Building section of the manuscript.
- Comment 1c, 1e, 1f, 1i, 1j, 1k, 1l: all focus on organization. We attempted to address these issues with the overall restructuring of the manuscript.
- Comment 1d: addressed the initial Results section. As part of the restructuring, all results have been consolidated into one Results section.
- Comment 1g: requested more thorough explanations of abbreviations and, more specifically, the PULL system. All abbreviations are now spelled out the first time they are used with the appropriate abbreviation in parentheses. PULL system has been changed to “Pull system,” because it is not an acronym and is not an abbreviation for a longer term. Also, more specific descriptions and explanations of previous studies are provided.
- Comment 1h: asks for examples of “new processes to impact patient capacity and flow.” These examples are included as bulleted points in the revised Preliminary #1 section.

Recommended Revisions from Reviewer #2

- Reviewer #2 discussed the lack of organization and structure that is apparent in the original manuscript. He/she points out the difficulty in differentiating between broader institutional initiatives and the actual study initiative. Our revised manuscript now offers a much more comprehensive and structured approach to other institutional initiatives and an improved structure and flow to the main project itself.
- The revised Results section now consists of one consolidated section of results for the study initiative only, and the Discussion section has been expanded to include the discussion points and limitations that were previously scattered throughout the manuscript.
- Issues of questionnaire and observational methods reliability and validity were addressed. For the questionnaire, additional statistics were included to address reliability and validity was addressed in both the methods and discussion sections. Validity and reliability of having a non research do observations was discussed in the discussion section.
- Reviewer #2 (paragraph #7) also commented on the “gratuitous comments” throughout the manuscript (by providing specific examples). These comments and all commentary regarding conference presentation have been eliminated.
- All references, citations, and overall formatting have been revised to ensure APA format compliance.

Recommended Revisions from Reviewer #3

- Many of Reviewer #3’s comments focused on the organization of the material. As stated above, the entire manuscript was reorganized based on

recommendations from both editors. This reorganization should resolve many of Reviewer #3's concerns.

- In paragraphs #3 and 4 of Reviewer #3's comments, he/she discussed the need for a single theme and stated objectives. The restructured manuscript now states the primary research question and its two key objectives up front in the first section of the manuscript. In conjunction with the restructuring of the manuscript, we feel that the main theme is much more clearly defined and stated.
- In review paragraph #12, Reviewer #3 requested that objective language be used to describe the project. As a result, we removed all superfluous comments and revised the content to be more objective.
- In conjunction with the removal of unnecessary commentary, we also removed the section that discusses the presentation of our project material. This was in response to Reviewer #3's comments in review paragraph #14.
- In paragraph #14, the reviewer requested that the discussion section should be longer. The Discussion section has been greatly expanded and now provides an overview and wrap up of the entire project.

Once again, thank you for the opportunity to revise this manuscript. In addition to the editors' and reviewers' comments, we also made the following changes:

- Deletion of unnecessary references
- Comment that all individuals acknowledged worked at Lehigh Valley Hospital and Health Network, and the addition of their titles
- Addition of Institutional Review Board waiver approval statement
- Revision of original abstract
- Rewording of some of original text

As you review the revised 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