Reviewer's report

Title: Differentiating Intraprofessional Attitudes toward Paradigms in Health Care Delivery among Chiropractic Factions: Results from a Randomly Sampled Survey

Version: 2
Date: 20 November 2013

Reviewer: Christopher Stevenson

Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions

I have a number of specific technical issues to raise first and then I will comment on the article overall:

1. Survey methods, para 5. It is not clear how the respondents were categorised as negative to vaccination. The vaccination consistency score could take values of up to 15, so what was the cutoff point that placed a respondent in the negative group and how was this cutoff chosen?

2. Survey administration, para 1. 749 people were selected in the sample. How was this sample size chosen? I would like to see a power analysis or some other justification of the sample size.

3. Data entry and analysis, para 2. What software was used to fit the logistic regression and how did the model fitting take account of the survey design. The regression analysis needs to take account of the sample stratification and survey weighting.

4. Results para 2. Did the estimates of the proportion of practitioners in each group take account of the stratification? Also, I would like to see confidence intervals to go with these estimates.

5. Discussion last para – limitations. The authors note that a limitation is the fact that the sample represented only approximately 12 percent of practitioners from each province. This is the wrong way to judge a survey sample. The accuracy of a sample depends only on the sample size – not on the proportion of the population selected in the sample. A proper power analysis and sample size calculation would address this limitation.

6. My overall comment on the paper is that the aim of the analysis is not clear to me. I understand the need to get a size estimate for the different groups within the chiropractic profession and the survey method is appropriate for that purpose. However, I don’t really understand the reason for the logistic regression. The authors seem to have shown that unorthodox views predict membership of the group of unorthodox practitioners – which seems hardly surprising. Why is this important?

Minor essential revisions

7. In reporting an analysis of survey data, it is important to provide the reader
with a copy of the survey instrument/questionnaire. That way we can see both the exact question wording and the layout and formatting of the questions – both of which may influence the validity of the survey results. This questionnaire could be included as an appendix to the paper.

8. Discussion para 4. The text says that 18.9% of practitioners are in the unorthodox group, but the results table says 18.8%.
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