

Reviewer #3 comments (written by Mickey Dougherty)

Pg. 3, para 1. Focus this para on need to have clinicians understand and use research. One approach is to have them become members of the research team.

Pgs 3-4. Approach. This section could be titled Model and the model could be presented in this section. A discussion of why cooperative learning is successful should be literature based.

Pg 6. Results. A different title would be more descriptive, perhaps Outcomes: team process and the research project. These “two sets of results” may reflect the objectives for the project. At this point, I question whether this manuscript can carry the two objectives. Switching from the team activities to the research is confusing and distracting. There is an adage in writing along the lines that any written product from editorial to book has a single theme and that the writer will succeed more quickly if he/she states that theme in one sentence. At this time, I do not think that a single theme is present in this manuscript.

It would be helpful to have the objectives stated, perhaps in a separate section, but somewhere near the beginning of the manuscript. Objectives inform the reader about what can be expected from the manuscript.

Pg 6, para.3 This section is probably background literature. The central point (few studies on ED waiting room) should be nearer the beginning of the paragraph.

Pg. 7, para 2 and 3. This content should probably go in a section on Setting.

Pg 6, last para, pg. 7, para 1-4. This material probably goes in a section on The ED Context

Pg. 8, para 5, pg 9, para 1. This material probably goes in a section on preliminary studies of the ED by the research team.

Pg. 9, para 3. This section could be changes to methods and it should include the three research approaches used, mapping the waiting room structure, survey and observations.

Pg. 10, para 2 and 3, pg. 11, para 1. Describe the survey. Reduce the presence of the researcher.

Pg 11, para 2, pg 12 para 1. This section seems to be on the procedures for carrying out the survey, and the section title could be changed. Stick to the procedure in this section. Hold the results for a Results section later.

Pg 12, para 2. Use objective language to describe what was done.

Pg 12, para 3. This could be titled Data Management and it should contain information on how data from the mapping (structure), survey and observations were handled. Save the results for the Results section.

Pg 13, para 2. This outcome may be a huge achievement for the research team. Placed in a manuscript it comes off weakly. It may be better to leave this out as a set of results and explain a little about how the research results were used in the Discussion section.

Pg 14, para 1. The Discussion could be longer and used to round out the team contributions to the success of the project.

Major reorganization is needed to reframe the manuscript around the research completed. In nearly all the sections on the research the actors should be deemphasized and the activities should be described. The cooperation and collaboration aspects could be handled in the discussion – perhaps.