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Ms. Calumpita,  

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 March 19, 2013. Revisions based on recommendations from the reviewers have been made to the manuscript (see attached) and are summarized below.  

Reviewer report: Carolyn Murray  

Major Compulsory Revisions  

1.  
   a. The theme ‘service development’ is now a sub-theme of ‘seeking and giving advice’. The content from the sub-theme ‘implementing theory and policy’ has been integrated into ‘service development’. Table 3 has been revised to reflect this change.  
   b. The sub-themes with the ‘networking’ theme have been removed.  
   c. The content from the sub-theme ‘role of occupational therapists’ in the theme ‘seeking and giving advice’ was integrated into the theme ‘role of occupational therapists’.  

2. The first sentence and the last two sentences of the second paragraph in the limitations and recommendations section have been reworded for clarity.  

Minor essential revisions:  

1. Word ‘clearly’ has been removed from results section of the abstract.  
2. The sentence in paragraph two of the introduction has been reworded.  
3. In the third paragraph of the introduction, sentences one, two and three have been reworded.  
4. In the third paragraph of the introduction, second half of the last sentence has been removed.  
5. Final sentence of the introduction has been joined with the preceding paragraph and the time frame of the study has been added.  
6. First sentence of the methods section has been reworded.  
7. First sentence of limitations and recommendations section has been reworded.  
8. Reference 3 has been corrected.
Reviewer report: Wendy Bryant

Discretionary revisions

1. In the background section ‘quick scan’ has been reworded to ‘preliminary scan’.
2. Exploration of social networking theories was not part of the objective of the study however, statements describing social networking theories have been included in the third paragraph of the discussion section.
3. The first paragraph of the limitations and recommendations section has been revised to reflect the decision conduct a deeper interpretative analysis due to the limitations of the thematic analysis.

We are grateful to the reviewers for their helpful comments, and trust that the amendments that we have made in line with each of their recommendations further enhance the paper. We look forward to hearing from you.

Respectfully,

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