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Responses to the remarks made by reviewers to the manuscript by L Bergman & U. Fors entitled "Computer-aided DSM-IV-diagnostics – Acceptance, use and perceived usefulness in relation to users’ Learning Styles"

Dear editor and reviewers, Thank you for all new valuable comments and improvement suggestions. We have now tried to carefully take care of all of them, as well as making the revised manuscript more readable and of better quality.

We hereby re-submit the manuscript and hope our improvements (including correction of the English language) make the manuscript acceptable for publishing.

November 5, 2004 Uno Fors & Lars Bergman

Comments to the reviewers:

Reviewer: Mark Albanese
Reviewer’s report:
- Major Compulsory Revisions
  1. The structure of the manuscript has improved. The description of learning styles (p. 9 may be moved to the introduction (p. 5) where learning styles are mentioned first.
     Thank you for the positive comment. The LS description is moved as suggested to the Introduction section.

  2. Outcome variables mentioned in the methods section (e.g., time variables) need to be reported somewhere in the results section.
     These are now included as Table 4

  3. p. 14, “results were calculated as mean, std, ….” Reporting of means, std are not used in the results section.
     This is corrected

  4. Portions of the suggested table (demographics of participants) can easily be integrated in the first para of p. 15.
     We have entered this as Table 1

  5. The results section includes interpretative statements (“less active and a rather low response rate,” “rather high general skills,” “clear correlation”) and the authors should consider just reporting the results.
     Thank you for commenting this. We have now tried to be more careful and clear.

  6. Page 16, para 1: provide some data for the variables mentioned (age distribution, level of professional training, decision time, etc.), which provides more information than the statement that the investigators did not find statistical differences.
     This is now included in Tables 1 and 4
7. Page 15, para 2: consider providing the actual results for positive attitudes (incomplete sentence?).
We have now tried to write these sentences more clearly and also indicated the positive attitudes in another way. Hope this is OK.

8. The authors should consider moving the section on “Overall results from Acceptance, Use and Perceived usefulness” to the discussion section. Thanks for this suggestion; we have moved the section accordingly.

9. Limitations: there are at least two limitations worthwhile mentioning (not “possible limitations”): 1) use of single case, and 2) selection bias. Rephrase 2nd sentence as the use of more cases does not necessarily increase the number of significant results. The fact that physicians decided not to participate due to time constraints raises the concern of selection bias as they may also be less prone to use computer technology, may be older, differ in learning styles, or other variables (some mentioned on p. 24).
We have now added these limitations and also tried to be clearer about these.

10. Conclusion section includes statements that are not supported by the data, e.g., “a risk of over-diagnosis,” acceptance of CDSS might be influenced by the level of professional training,” or “computer training might increase CDSS acceptance.” Conclusions should be limited to the findings of the study and are limited to learning styles of psychiatrists in education or practice.
This is now corrected.

11. The authors are again encouraged to check carefully the accuracy of the cited references, e.g. ref #2 (deDombal) is a letter to the editor. Either use full name or abbreviations of journals; if journal abbreviations are used, followed the appropriate abbreviations; be consistent with the use of “volume” and “number” (follow guidelines for authors); ref# 22: incomplete ref and URL does not point to article; ref# 30: dead URL link.
We have worked through all of the references and tried to be as clear and correct as possible. The incorrect URL of the #22 is deleted and the #30 URL is verified as working/up and running.

Reviewer: Eta Berner
Reviewer's report:
Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
1. The authors appear to feel that only the significant results need to be mentioned. This is misleading. The authors should either use the tables they included in the responses to reviewers' comments or be clear in the text that they correlated a number of variables, but only a few were significant. They also should include in the methods what correlations were examined and what variables were compared.
We have now included the suggested tables (Table 1 and Table 4) as well as tried to be clearer in the description of the methods and results.
2. Need to add to the limitations (a) that computer skills were self-report (b) that it is possible that some subjects may have seen the case before, even though attempts were made to blind it.
   This is now included in the “Limitations” section under Discussions

3. As previously mentioned, the authors do not present any data to support that computer training might increase acceptance of CDSS. This should not be mentioned in the conclusions
   We are sorry for this mistake. This is now corrected in the Conclusions section.