

To: Sherry Handfinger, Dorothy Jones, and Suzanne Bakken
From: Judith A. Erlen and Susan Sereika
Date: September 30, 2005
Re: Revised manuscript

We revised our manuscript based on the reviewers' helpful critique and have attached that document. The comments and suggestions have assisted us to focus the paper and to minimize redundancy. We hope that our revised manuscript addresses the critique satisfactorily. Please contact us if you have additional questions: Judith A. Erlen (412-624-1906; jac001@pitt.edu) or Susan Sereika (412-624-0799; ssereika@pitt.edu). Thank you.

The following changes were made:

Reviewer #1

The parent study was briefly described and differentiated from the sub-study presented in this paper.

The specific aims were changed to research questions and placed at the end of the background section. The study has been described as descriptive correlational in the methods section.

Race/ethnicity was identified as self-report data. Two groups (whites and nonwhites) were used as we had very few Latino participants; also, several participants identified themselves as "other" or multi-racial making a more discrete classification difficult.

The results have been confined to the major analyses.

The minor issues that were identified were addressed.

The paper was formatted to conform to APA (5th ed.).

Reviewer #2

The title was changed to reflect the content of the paper.

The terminology was clarified and used consistently throughout to avoid confusion between adherence and fidelity.

The background section was re-organized and several examples of intervention studies were added.

The paragraph on social cognitive and self-efficacy theories was moved and is now the introduction to the theoretically based intervention for the parent study.

The parent study has been briefly described.

The endpoints were clarified and a brief rationale provided in the section describing the measure to collect those data.

The idea of “doubling-up” was clarified.

“Attempted calls” was clarified so that each attempt is counted. The definition that we had been using for no attempts was that contact was made on the first try. We decided that it was clearer to change the terminology to telephone calls and count the actual number of calls that were placed.

The focus of each of the 12 intervention sessions is provided.

The quality assurance process that was used in the parent study is described.

Discussion of the effectiveness of the intervention has not been included as this paper is currently in preparation.

The conclusion was revised.

The figures were deleted. We agree that they did not add to the results section.

Reviewer #3

The abstract was revised to reflect the changes that were made in the paper.

Fidelity to the intervention was clarified and used consistently throughout.

The theoretical perspectives section was moved to the section describing the intervention used in the parent study. The content of each session in the intervention was identified.

The parent study is briefly described.

The purpose was sharpened. The specific aims were rewritten as research questions and used to introduce the results section.

The procedures to assure intervention integrity have been included as they relate to the intervention delivery.

The rationale for the selected endpoints was included.

The analysis now reflects the questions addressed in the study.

The notion of treatment/intervention fidelity is introduced in the background section.

The discussion was shortened and addresses the results.

The figures were deleted.