Author's response to reviews

Title: The Role of Interpersonal Communication in the Process of Knowledge Mobilization within a Community-Based Organization: A Network Analysis

Authors:

Heather L Gainforth (heather.gainforth@queensu.ca)
Amy E Latimer-Cheung (amy.latimer@queensu.ca)
Peter Athanasopoulos (petera@cpaont.org)
Spencer Moore (mooresp@queensu.ca)
Kathleen Martin Ginis (martink@mcmaster.ca)

Version: 3 Date: 23 March 2014

Author's response to reviews: see over
Response to Reviewers

We thank the reviewers for their detailed and thoughtful review of our paper. Below we address each of the minor essential revisions requested.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. “A principal component analysis revealed a one-factor solution for these items.” Which items exactly and what is the meaning/name of this new scale?

   A line has been added stating, “A principal component analysis revealed a one-factor solution for the three behaviour items (i.e., visiting the SCI Action Canada website; speaking to an individual with SCI about physical activity; and downloading guidelines). The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure verified adequate sampling for the analysis, KMO = .62 (Field, 2013). The single factor had an eigenvalue greater 1 (=2.06) which explained 68.56% of the variance. Therefore, the behaviour items were summed to create a scale (Cronbach’s alpha = .77). Higher scores on this combined scale indicate greater adoption of physical activity promotion behaviours.” (Page 9, Line 178).

2. “we examined our network data as a directed, symmetric network”. I think a network is directed and asymmetric or un-directed and symmetric, but not symmetric and directed. What should it be?

   We apologize for this typo. This line now reads, “Because we were interested in the degree to which staff might send or receive information to others, we examined our network data as an undirected, symmetric network.” (Page 9, Line 185).

3. “Results of the chi square test of independence revealed that membership in the core was associated and the physical activity guidelines for people with SCI, $\chi^2(1, N = 55) = .02, p < .05.$” This is not a correct sentence, should it be: “Results of the chi square test of independence revealed that membership in the core was associated with the physical activity guidelines for people with SCI, $\chi^2(1, N = 55) = .02, p < .05$”?

   We thank the reviewer for this correction. The line now reads, “Results of the chi square test of independence revealed that membership in the core was associated with knowledge of the physical activity guidelines for people with SCI, $\chi^2(1, N = 55) = .02, p < .05.$” (Page 11, 212).

Discretionary Revisions

4. Concerning this sentence in the introduction: “we examined (...) the centrality of staff within the CBO network.” As the rest of the CBO is no longer part of the study, it might be more correct to skip the part “within the CBO network” because it suggests that you network is larger than just the staff.
This change has been made (Page 6).

5. “A total of 56 staff completed the network survey”. Please add the total nr. Of staff and the response rate, this will also clarify the sentence: “In total, participants named 78 staff with whom they shared information”.

A response rate has been added to the results section (Page 10, Line 200).

6. What exactly are the numbers (Mage = 48.61±39.80 yrs) and 4.64±4.94 years representing? Mean age upper and lower bound? Or something else?

These represent standard deviations. These lines now read, A total of 56 staff (M<sub>age</sub> = 48.61; SD = 39.80 yrs) completed the network survey (72% response rate). Staff were predominantly female (77%) and university educated (72%). On average, staff worked for the CBO for 4.64 years (SD = 4.94) and the majority of staff did not have a SCI (77%).” (Page 10, Line 200).