

Reviewer's report

Title: Information Transfer: What do decision-makers want and need from researchers

Version: 2 Date: 3 February 2007

Reviewer: Leif Solberg

Reviewer's report:

General

The authors have made prodigious efforts to respond to my concerns, and have satisfactorily addressed them. However, in the process, they have produced a paper that is much too long and diffuse, with too many tables. I believe that they could shorten both by 1/2 without losing any important content. While doing this, they should also rearrange some of the content that is in the wrong section of the IMRAD format. For example, much of the explanation for the organizational choices should probably be in a much shortened Introduction rather than the methods and the comments on the Results should really be in the Discussion section. Finally, there is need for closer attention to sentence structure, placement of commas, etc. to facilitate reader understanding.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.