Author's response to reviews

Title: Validation of the modified Fresno Test: assessing physical therapists' evidence based practice knowledge and skills

Authors:

    Julie K Tilson (tilson@usc.edu)

Version: 4 Date: 24 April 2010

Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Dr. Graham,

I am responding to Associate Editor comments regarding manuscript MS: 1026086047322016 “Validation of the modified Fresno Test: assessing physical therapists' evidence based practice knowledge and skills”. Thank you for your rapid response and helpful suggestions for the manuscript.

In the text below, I have provided point-by-point responses to your comments. All changes to the manuscript are noted using ‘track changes’.

Comment 1.0: Attached to this message is an edited version of the abstract, which largely encompasses the needed refinements.

Response 1.0: Many of the additional editorial comments have been maintained. However, the use of ‘we’ was removed as this is a single author manuscript. I appreciate the value of writing in the active voice, however, for this abstract, in several instances, this would require the use of “I” which I did not feel was appropriate in style of flow for the abstract.

Comment 1.1: The word count is now <300 words, increasing the likelihood of full reproduction by PubMED

Response 1.1: The word count is maintained <300 words.

Comment 1.2: Several details included in the “Methods” section are more appropriate to the “Results” and have been moved accordingly. These include the actual numbers of volunteers falling into the 3 learner level categories.

Response 1.2: The actual numbers of volunteers falling into the 2 learner level categories is maintained is in the Results section.
Comment 1.3: Editorialization within the methods and results, e.g. comments such as “the.............. indices of the test were excellent.............” has been minimized. Recommendations have likewise been removed from the “Results”.
Response 1.3: These changes have been maintained per the editors recommendations.

Comment 1.4: The conclusion has been slightly softened.
Response 1.4: These changes have been maintained.

Comment 2.0: A parallel change in the manuscript, on P8, is appropriate. The actual numbers of volunteers falling into the different learner level categories is more appropriately placed in the Results. At the bottom of the page, the criterion for determining the number of test results independently scored by both raters should be presented independently of the actual number of volunteer subjects enrolled. The actual number should then be presented in the Results section.
Response 2.0: The actual numbers of volunteers that fall into the different learner level categories have been moved from the Methods (page 8) to the Results (page 10).

The actual number of volunteer subjects enrolled has been removed from the Methods (bottom of page 8) and presented in the Results (page 10).

The Results section now contains the sentence: “A total of 108 individuals (31 EBP-novice PT students, 50 EBP-trained PT students, and 27 EBP-expert PT faculty) enrolled in the study and completed the modified FT."

I respectfully submit these changes for your review.

Sincerely,

Julie K. Tilson