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Author's response to reviews: see over
Reviews of our paper titled ‘Investigating the utility of an online discussion group for health professionals: A case example from forensic occupational therapy’ were received by email on December 5, 2012. Revisions based on recommendations from two reviewers (Murray & Bryant) have been made to the manuscript (see attached) and are summarized below. We note the third reviewer did not make any recommendations.

**Formatting changes**

1. Competing interests
   a. A competing interests statement was added after the Conclusions section

2. Tables
   a. Tables have been reformatted

**Reviewer report: Carolyn Murray**

1. Forensic occupational therapy has been defined in paragraph 2 of the Introduction section
2. Last sentence in paragraph 1 of the Background has been removed; further elaboration has been added to Discussion and Limitations & Recommendations sections.
3. The objective of the study has been clearly stated at the end of the Introduction section.
   a. The word ‘utility’ in the title was changed to ‘purpose’ for consistent terminology throughout the paper.
4. A brief section on the history and development of the group has been added to page 3.
5. Recommendations for research activities within the group and future research of the group are made at the end of the Limitations and Recommendations section.
6. A statement clarifying that ethical review for the study was not required has been elaborated and referenced in first paragraph of the Methods section. The reference has been added to the reference list.
7. The word ‘qualitative’ has been removed to more accurately reflect the case study method.
8. Results
   a. The 9 themes in the Results section have been consolidated into 6 – merging ‘exchanging information’ with ‘seeking & giving advice’ and merging ‘miscellaneous’ and ‘professional development’ with ‘networking’.
b. Having reviewed the quotes in the section ‘professional development’ (now called ‘communication of specific events’ within the ‘networking’ theme), the quotes do not contain any information that would identify the person who wrote the post. The direct quotes are publicly available information about local and international professional development events; as such, the quotes remain as originally submitted.

c. A statement within ‘student learning’ was revised to be clear that the debate occurred within the online discussion.

d. Subheadings within Results section have been revised to reflect organization of content.

e. A statement of how country of origin of each post was identified was added to the end of paragraph 1 of the Methods section.

f. An unknown section was added to Table 1.

9. A statement regarding research within the online group has been added to the second last paragraph of the Discussion section.

10. Recommendations for research activities within the group and future research of the group are made at the end of the Limitations and Recommendations section.

Minor essential revisions:

1. Methods
   a. Sentence 3 reworded as recommended
   b. Sentence beginning ‘the first author…’ reworded as recommended

2. Results
   a. Replace ‘autumn of 2008’ with September 2008’
   b. ‘occupational assessment’ has specific meaning and has not been revised

3. Discussion - second paragraph has been revised as recommended

Reviewer report: Wendy Bryant

1. The objective of the study has been clearly stated at the end of the Introduction section.

2. The 9 themes in the Results section have been consolidated into 6 – merging ‘exchanging information’ with ‘seeking & giving advice’ and merging ‘miscellaneous’ and ‘professional development’ with ‘networking’.

3. Exploration of social networking theories was not part of the objective of the study and has not been included in the paper

4. A statement clarifying the significance of a predominantly UK sample has been added to the second paragraph of the Discussion section.

5. Statements regarding research within the online group have been added within the ‘Introduction’ on page 3 and to the second last paragraph of the Discussion section on page 13.

Minor discretionary revisions

1. When speaking of the current state of the website, present tense is used. When speaking of research process and findings, past tense is used.
2. The annotated reviewer copy with highlighted sections has been reviewed and revisions based on the above statement have been made.

We are grateful to the reviewers for their comments and suggestions, the amendments made have certainly improved the paper.

Respectfully,

Crystal Dieleman          Edward Duncan  
crystal.dieleman@dal.ca    edward.duncan@stir.ac.uk