Author's response to reviews

Title: People, Organizational, and Leadership Factors Impacting Informatics Support for Clinical and Translational Research

Authors:

Philip RO Payne (philip.payne@osumc.edu)
Taylor R Pressler (taylor.pressler@gmail.com)
Indra N Sarkar (neil.sarkar@uvm.edu)
Yves Lussier (lussier@chicago.edu)

Version: 6 Date: 13 December 2012

Author's response to reviews: see over
BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making

**RE: MS 5178116027036207 - “People, Organizational, and Leadership Factors Impacting Informatics Support for Clinical and Translational Research” (formerly entitled: “People, Organizational, and Leadership Factors Influencing Access to Informatics Expertise and Resources in the Academic Clinical and Translational Research Environment”)**

Dear Sir or Madam:

Please find attached to this cover letter a third revision to our manuscript entitled “People, Organizational, and Leadership Factors Impacting Informatics Support for Clinical and Translational Research” (formerly entitled: “People, Organizational, and Leadership Factors Influencing Access to Informatics Expertise and Resources in the Academic Clinical and Translational Research Environment”). We would again like to thank the referee for their comprehensive, thoughtful, and highly constructive critique of our submission. We believe that as a whole, the revisions we have made to the manuscript, as outlined below, serve to address these concerns and improve our submission.

- **Critique #1:** Wording of manuscript needs to be simplified and made more concise (including title, abstract, and introductory paragraphs).
  - **Response #1:** We have edited the manuscript extensively to simplify and render more concise the language used throughout. We have also
shortened/simplified the title, introduction, and background sections of the submission.

- **Critique #2:** Definition and use of the term “translational” needs to be clarified
  - **Response #2:** We included a specific set of definitions used in our work for both “clinical research” and “translational research” (per NIH conventions) as part of our revised Background section. In addition, in the description of the methods in our paper, we have described the specific search strategies used to retrieve document self-identified by their authors as pertaining to the Clinical and Translational Science (CTS) domain. That being said, this component of our analysis is subject to some variability due to the reliance on protocol authors to self-identify CTS relevance, and thus, we cannot ensure absolute consistency relative to the use of such terminology by those authors.

- **Critique #3:** Specific details concerning types of documents used during thematic analyses are not provided
  - **Response #3:** We revised our discussion for the methods and results for this component of our study to specific classes of documents that were included in our analyses (in addition to specifying the types of documents that were omitted/censored).

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you require any further information in order to evaluate this resubmission. We will look forward to your comments and feedback on our manuscript.

Respectfully,

Philip R.O. Payne, Ph.D.