

Reviewer's report

Title: Mapping as a Knowledge Translation Tool for Ontario Early Years Centres: Views from Data Analysts and Managers

Version: 2 Date: 13 November 2007

Reviewer: Diane Cowper

Reviewer's report:

General

In the first review, I requested that the authors address three issues: (1) the potential bias of their sample; (2) a more detailed description of their intervention; and (3) coding reliability and validity. In my view, the authors responded adequately to these three points. Specifically, (1) they clarified that only three OEYCs were experienced and that none of the participants were involved in the earlier project (p. 20); (2) they included a footnote on page 6 that provided more information on the EYeMap web-based mapping tool; and (3) they added more detail on the procedures used to insure consistency across transcripts and that the "emerging patterns were discussed, challenged and interpreted... at a peer debriefing session." (page 8). I am satisfied with their responses. I believe this article will be of interest to other researchers who use GIS tools to convey information to policy and decision makers, especially the discussion of modifiable factors that might enhance adaptation of mapping tools in the workplace.

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)

Some minor edits (e.g., placement of commas) could be made, but I'm sure this will be picked up by the journal editors.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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