

Author's response to reviews

Title: Interventions Aimed at Increasing Research Use in Nursing: A Systematic Review

Authors:

David S Thompson (dst3@ualberta.ca)

Carole A Estabrooks (carole.estabrooks@ualberta.ca)

Shannon Scott-Findlay (shannon.scott-findlay@ualberta.ca)

Katherine Moore (katherine.moore@ualberta.ca)

Lars Wallin (lars.wallin@karolinska.se)

Version: 4 **Date:** 10 April 2007

Author's response to reviews: see over

April 10, 2007

Martin Eccles,
Editor in Chief, Implementation Science
University of Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

Dear Dr Eccles:

We appreciate the thorough review of our manuscript and feel the editors' and the reviewer's comments have strengthened the reporting of our research. As requested, we have revised our manuscript based on the comments and provided a point-by-point response below.

REVIEWER DISCRETIONARY COMMENTS

1. The reviewer pointed out that nursing practice is expanding to include care more closely aligned with traditional medical practices (i.e., prescribing & diagnosing)
 - We acknowledged the expanding role of nursing in the first paragraph of page 2 in the Introduction
2. The reviewer pointed out that we do not justify why self report of research use is valid
 - We acknowledge that self report is not perfect and point out on page 5 of the discussion that current measures exhibit a common set of problems
 - We strengthened the argument for measures of research use (as opposed to behavior change) – specifically, we made changes to the 2nd and 3rd paragraphs on page 3 of the Introduction
3. The reviewer pointed out that she views our exclusion of nurse practitioner studies as a weakness but does not expect us to address
 - We did not address this in the manuscript

EDITORS COMMENTS

1. The editor pointed out the Abstract should be changed to reflect suggestions
 - We changed the Conclusions in the abstract by removing the two sentences making reference to interventions that 'may' be effective and removing the statement recommending theory be used to develop interventions
2. The editor suggested removing statements suggesting interventions 'may' be effective
 - We removed these statements throughout the manuscript
3. Introduction line three is missing a 'that'
 - We added a 'that' before 'a lack of research'
4. The editor pointed out that the second paragraph of the Introduction is difficult to understand (nursing is typically responsible....)

- We expanded this sentence and added that nursing provides continuous care over short periods while medicine provides episodic care over longer durations (as suggested)
5. The editor pointed out that we need to acknowledge the differences we outlined are related to inpatient care and may not extend to day or community care
 - We acknowledge this in the second paragraph of the Introduction
 6. The editor asked that we formulate the last paragraph of the Introduction as a formal aim
 - We revised as suggested
 7. The editor had difficulty understanding the last but one sentence in the Educational Meetings section of the Results
 - We assumed this was in reference to ‘direct’ and ‘indirect’ and added explanations/examples for ‘direct’ and ‘indirect’
 8. Missing a ‘d’ on described in the same section
 - We added a ‘d’ on described
 9. The editor did not agree with our conclusion at the end of the Results section—namely that our findings represent a lack of evidence
 - We changed our conclusion to ‘inconclusive evidence’ in this section and throughout the paper
 10. The editor suggested we delete the last sentence of the Summary of Findings
 - We deleted the last sentence of the Summary of Findings
 11. The editor suggested an alternate for finishing the last sentence before the Limitations section
 - We finished this sentence as suggested
 12. The editor suggested we delete the ‘theory-based intervention development’ section of the Recommendations and shorten and incorporate the ‘outcome measurement’ and ‘study design and reporting’ sections into the Discussion
 - We deleted the ‘theory-based..’) section of the Recommendations
 - We shortened incorporated the ‘outcome measurement’ and ‘study design...’ sections of the Recommendations into the Discussion
 13. The editor questioned validity of the second sentence of our conclusion
 - We deleted the second sentence of our conclusion

These suggestions have clearly strengthened our research and we look forward to your response. If I can provide further clarification please contact me.

Best wishes,

David S. Thompson

cc

Carole Estabrooks

Shannon Scott-Findlay

Lars Wallin

Katherine Moore