

FM REVIEW 2016 5

All reviewers recommended major revisions. These are a summary of concerns

Reviewer 1:

Reviewer 1 raises many essential contextual points. Specifically, he notes corporate, institutional, and social pressures mitigating against the goals and ideals of behavioral health; the importance of medical humanities in behavioral science teaching; the triadic relationships (and more in the inpatient setting) which have replaced the dyadic patient-doctor relationship of the past; the fact that in shifting to a systems model insights and skills have been gained, but more psychodynamic interpretations and awareness have been lost.

Each of these probably deserves a paper in its own right. In my mind, the most critical to acknowledge is the tension between behavioral health goals and the corporatization of health care. It might be possible to address the remaining points with a brief acknowledgment (for example, you do mention interprofessional teamwork while noting it is beyond the scope of the paper; you could allude to medical humanities as an intriguing complement to behavioral science teaching; and you could note valuable insights from past models).

Reviewer 2:

- 1) Clarify whether you consider this a structured review of the literature**
- 2) State scope of article upfront**
- 3) Little more clarification of wordle methodology**
- 4) Explain why specific time frames were chosen**
- 5) Section on integrated care requires some clarification, especially distinguishing between clinical and residency to the extent possible**
- 6) Timeline for important dates for big ideas in behavioral science development**

Reviewer 2 would like more information on the methodology, both in terms of the how the review of the literature (including search terms) and the construction and interpretation of the wordless. Similarly, this reviewer requests a rationale for the time frames chosen, and suggests that a timeline of important dates for “big ideas” in behavioral science development might give a more linear understanding of the evolution of the field. This reviewer also points out some minor discrepancies in terms of when certain events occurred and in conjunction with which other developments.

Reviewer 3:

- 1) Consider reorganizing the paper – a) there seem to be only 3 phases, rather than 4 b) consider organizing by topic – and changes over time within topic – rather than by temporal phases c) why did only middle years have subsections? – it would be more consistent if all sections were formatted similarly**
- 2) Would a frequency table comparing early and later years be more useful than the wordle?**

- 3) Would like to know behavioral science search terms utilized (perhaps in appendix) so review strategy could be replicated
- 4) Consider mentioning the role of behavioral science in research and scholarship

Similarly, Reviewer 3 suggests clearer organization. It is hard to find the “current phase” of behavioral science. Rather, the paper seems to be broken down into early, middle, and future, with additional A-heads of Expansion of the Common Ground and Integrated Behavioral Health. These appear to refer to “current phase,” but the lack of consistency in the formatting of headings is confusing. Another lack of consistency is that only the middle years have sub-heads. Is this because there was more going on during this phase?

This reviewer suggests a reorganization of the paper based on theme rather than temporality. However, I think the same effect could be accomplished if you were to note under “scope of paper” that you plan to discuss various thematic evolutions within these periods. However, this makes all the more important presenting a rationale for why these phases of early/middle/current were organized as they are.

This reviewer also recommends a frequency table rather than the wordless. Personally, I like the visual effect the wordless offer, but please consider whether this suggestion would provide more information.

Finally, reviewer 3 proposes mentioning research as a component of behavioral science. The academic and scholarly contributions of behavioral science faculty are plentiful, and if possible research efforts should be noted in the text.

Reviewer 4

- 1) More reflection – what’s it all mean?
- 2) Interesting insight about the excessive and unrealistic ambition of the early core competencies breeding resentment and inadequacy – might be addressed briefly in a footnote
- 3) Better heading for the third section

Reviewer 4 notes some of the problems with the early core competencies. If you agree with this point, it could be referenced briefly in a footnote.

Perhaps more importantly, this reviewer laments the relative paucity of reflection in the piece. While agreeing that limited space constricts opportunities for reflection, it might be possible in the final section on “Future” to reflect a bit more broadly on what has been gained over the past 50 years; what if anything has been lost; and how the earlier visions of behavioral science both point to and made adaptations to what likely lies ahead.

Given the length limitations of the paper, it is likely not possible to adequately address all reviewer concerns. We would be able to accommodate expansion of the paper to 3500 words to address those you deem most important.

