

FM REVIEW 2012 1

TO EDITOR: This is an interesting study that I believe deserves publication. As the authors point out, many schools (including my own) publish in-house journals of original creative work; yet to my knowledge there have been no previous reports of the effects on students resulting from exposure to these journals.

The response rate reported is adequate for a survey. From the brief description, the survey itself seems appropriately designed and takes into consideration the problem of positive bias.

I do have a few questions for the authors:

- 1) Was the survey pilot-tested? If so, on whom? If not, why not?
- 2) Why were only the 7 positive items chosen for analysis? When negative items are included in surveys, often the scoring is reversed to obtain information consistent with the positive items.
- 3) Did the survey determine whether the students were familiar with HEAL? It is possible that among the 20% who did not agree with its value, there may have been some students who had never actually read/viewed the journal.
- 4) Since the authors report gathering year of training, gender, and age data, I wonder if they analyzed surveys using this information; and if so, what were the results.
- 5) Similarly, since they mention the significant differences found using chi-square analyses, the Discussion should note how they interpret this finding.
- 6) Although the authors acknowledge the skew toward 1st and 2nd yr students represented in respondents in the limitations, I wonder if they couldn't elaborate on how this might have influenced the results. For example, I know that at our medical school, it is the first and second year students who comprise the student editorial board, are the most active submitters, and are most involved with the journal. If a similar pattern were true at Florida State, this might have driven the results in a positive direction.

There are a few minor typos and stylistic errors that should be corrected (I've included a version of the paper with these corrections made in Track-Change).

I recommend publication of this work.

TO AUTHOR: congratulate you on investigating a topic that has received, to my knowledge, no empirical attention. Your response rate is adequate, and the survey sounds well-designed.

I do have a few questions:

- 1) Did you pilot-test the survey? If so, can you describe this process briefly? If not, why not?**
- 2) Why were only the 7 positive items chosen for analysis? When negative items are included in surveys, often the scoring is reversed to obtain information consistent with the positive items.**
- 3) Did the survey determine whether the students were familiar with HEAL? It is possible that among the 20% who did not agree with its value, there may have been some students who had never actually read/viewed the journal.**
- 4) Since you report gathering year of training, gender, and age data, I wonder if you analyzed surveys using this information; and if so, what were the results.**
- 5) Similarly, since you mention the significant differences found using chi-square analyses, the Discussion should note how you interpret these finding. In other words, state how the levels of significance achieved strengthen your conclusions.**
- 6) Although you acknowledge the skew toward 1st and 2nd yr students represented in respondents in the limitations, I wonder if you couldn't elaborate on how this might have influenced the results. For example, I know that at our medical school, it is the first and second year students who comprise the student editorial board, are the most active submitters, and are most involved with the journal. If a similar pattern were true at Florida State, this might have driven the results in a positive direction.**

You might mention that the survey items analyzed are included in table 2.

There are a few minor typos and stylistic errors that should be corrected (I've included a version of the paper with these corrections made in Track-Change).

Overall, I really enjoyed this report, and am delighted to see these kinds of investigations being undertaken. This makes a valuable contribution to the literature and opens up a worthwhile line of future inquiry.

COMMENTS TO EDITOR II: I am basically satisfied with this revision, and would very much like to see this article published. (One comment - it is SO frustrating to see revisions without track-change, it makes finding the changes [if they exist] so much harder. Authors need to be asked to submit

revisions in this format!). I had expressed interest in a gender and year of training breakdown of the data, but I don't feel this is essential to an understanding of the article. Otherwise, the issues I raised in my review have been addressed, including confusion about which survey questions were analyzed, removal of the chi square analysis, clarification about lack of pilot testing and whether all respondents were actually familiar with HEAL; and a fuller discussion of possible sources of bias. I liked this article initially, and I still like it. I hope it will be accepted.

COMMENTS TO AUTHOR II: My initial review had a question about which survey items were actually analyzed. I'm assuming from the new version that ALL items were included in analysis, is this correct? I also wondered whether data were examined by gender and year of training, to point toward future research investigating these issues. This was not addressed, but I am content to leave these questions aside. Finally, it appears as though statistical analyses have been removed, that is probably a more accurate and conservative approach, which I support.

One small point - there is no Table 2, so Table 3 should become Table 2, and the reference changed in the text as well.

The Discussion incorporates the issues I raised, thank you. I think the article reads very well, and definitely makes an important contribution to the literature. Thanks for this research!