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Reviewer’s report:

The manuscript titled “Telephone and face to face methods of assessment of veteran’s community reintegration yield equivalent results” discusses the results of research to look at the differences in telephone versus face-to-face administration of the Community Reintegration of Service Members (CRIS) measure. There was good ICC correlation of scale items suggesting that the administration of the CRIS via telephone is a viable approach. The manuscript was well-organized and clearly written. The results of psychometrically testing the CRIS instrument were clearly presented. There were no critical flaws notable in this manuscript; therefore, my suggestions are largely editorial.

Major Compulsory Revisions

None

Minor Essential Revisions

1. First full paragraph on page 3, under “Background” section, the text reads “…Iraq and Afghanistan (Operation Iraqi Freedom/Operation Enduring Freedom [OIF/OEF]). Subsequent references to the wars are written “OEF/OIF.” The latter is the VA recommended presentation. The sentence in the first paragraph on page three should be revised to this format (OEF/OIF).

2. In the first sentence of first full paragraph on page 7 the author’s state “Greater social distance between the respondent…” From the sociological literature, social distance refers to demographic differences, such as race, ethnicity, class, education, etc. I suspect the author’s are saying that an interviewer’s diminished physical presence can lead to a sense of participant anonymity which can lead to more disclosure. If my reading is correct, then social distance should be revised to physical distance (or some similar phrasing).

3. Page 7, under the paragraph in the Order of Administration section, last sentence reading “Thus, we examined…” There should be a space between words.

4. Page 7 and 8: In the paragraph that begins on page 7 reading “No prior studies…” participants are referred to as “veterans”, then two sentences later as “patients”, and in the sentence following as “subjects”. The changes in label threw me. I realize this is research on a veteran patient population and it is standard to refer to research participants as “subjects”, but it might make for
easier reading to use a participant label consistently throughout the manuscript.

5. Page 8, second sentence under Data Collection, the authors write “The interview script was fined…” Do they mean refined?

Discretionary Revisions

6. Last sentence of first full paragraph on page 6 the authors state “It is theorized that non-verbal cues provided through face-to-face interviewing can enhance the motivation of participants, keeping them more engaged and thus more likely to carefully respond.” I would caution the use of the phrase “It is theorized” because it is not clear if it is the authors theorizing or others. If others, the authors should cite them. See Holstein and Gubrium’s (1995) The Active Interview for a discussion on interpersonal dynamics during the face-to-face interview session, including a discussion of the unintended negative consequences of the interviewer’s facial expressions and body posture.
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