

**Author's response to reviews**

**Title:** Tobacco cessation Clinical Practice Guideline use in rural and urban hospital nurses: A pre-implementation needs assessment

**Authors:**

Patricia M Smith ([psmith@nosm.ca](mailto:psmith@nosm.ca))  
Scott M Sellick ([sellicks@tbh.net](mailto:sellicks@tbh.net))  
Michelle M Spadoni ([m spadon@lakeheadu.ca](mailto:m spadon@lakeheadu.ca))

**Version:** 8 **Date:** 22 March 2012

**Author's response to reviews:** see over



Northern Ontario  
School of Medicine

March 14, 2011

Philippa Harris, PhD  
Executive Editor  
BMC Nursing  
BioMed Central

Dear Dr. Harris,

We are pleased to resubmit the manuscript "*Tobacco cessation clinical practice guideline use in rural and urban hospital nurses: A pre-implementation needs assessment*" for your re-review and consideration for publication as an original research contribution in *BMC Nursing*.

We have addressed the Reviewer's concerns regarding point 1 as you requested in your letter and have provided our response below.

I will continue to be the corresponding author on this submission.

Thank you for considering this manuscript.

Sincerely,

Patricia M. Smith, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor  
Northern Ontario School of Medicine  
Office: [psmith@nosm.ca](mailto:psmith@nosm.ca)

West Campus  
Lakehead University  
955 Oliver Road  
Thunder Bay ON P7B 5E1  
Tel: 807-766-7300  
Fax: 807-766-7370

East Campus  
Laurentian University  
935 Ramsey Lake Road  
Sudbury ON P3E 2C6  
Tel: 705-675-4883  
Fax: 705-675-4858

[www.normed.ca](http://www.normed.ca)

**Referee:** Doris Y.P. Leung

**Title of paper:** Tobacco cessation clinical practice guidelines in rural and urban hospitals: A pre-implementation nursing needs assessment

**Date returned:** 13 March 2012

**Recommendations:** **Discretionary Revision**

(1) Bonferroni adjustment

Still the authors have not responded to the ‘justification’ of the individual p-values set at 0.004, 0.05 etc. for each of the different types of comparisons on p.11. They need to tell what is there overall Type I error they intended to achieve with the number of comparisons to be made in each case. This is important information as it is used judge if the statistical test is significance according to a pre-defined level of significance to ensure we are not ‘manipulating’ the results (in term of statistical significance).

Response: This has been clarified (p 11).

To maintain the probability of “family-wise” Type 1 errors occurring at  $\alpha = 0.05$ , a Bonferroni adjustment for the family-wise comparisons was used (n tests/.05), which resulted in the p value being set at  $\alpha = .01$  for the family comparisons of global 5A’s, demographics, beliefs/confidence/time, systems, and intervention activities for “advise” and “assist”, and at  $\alpha = .004$  for facilitating factors and  $\alpha = .003$  for inhibiting factor comparisons. For “ask”, “arrange”, and “assess” activity comparisons, the p value was set at  $\alpha = .05$ ,  $\alpha = .03$ , and  $\alpha = .02$ , respectively.

(2) Response from the 13th hospital

While I accept the reason for no response from the 13th hospital as stated in the covering letter, it is also important to communicate the message to the readers as well. May be the authors can put it as the 13th hospital redrew their consent afterwards as the hospital ‘did not welcome’ the distribution of the questionnaire.

Response: The lack of response from nurses was not related to the hospital’s consent to participate. That is, hospital administration did not withdraw its consent and it did welcome the distribution of questionnaires. In the Results section we state that nurses from 12/13 participating hospitals returned completed surveys; since 11 surveys did not indicate a hospital it was possible that at least some of them were from the 13<sup>th</sup> hospital but we have no way of knowing since the surveys were anonymous and for these 11, the respondents did not indicate a hospital which was their right as per the ethics clearance. As such, we have not made any changes.

(3) Limitation of the study

The authors only stated that the sample might not be representative but not providing the direction of the potential bias. Since the authors should be the one who have the information, they should tell the readers how to interpret the results of their study.

Response: we cannot provide the direction of the potential bias because we do not know what direction it might take—for example, in the results section, we did include comments from nurses saying it was not their job to interfere with patients smoking.

Therefore, it is possible that nurses who do not believe in intervening with tobacco were in fact the ones to complete the survey just as it is often the case that unhappy consumers are the ones to write letters to a company from whom they purchased a consumer good or to write a negative editorial in a newspaper. As such, we have not made any changes.