Dear Dr. Ross,

Enclosed, please find revisions for the manuscript (#A357/01), “Effects of Empowerment Among HIV-Positive Women on the Patient-Provider Relationship,” by Marelich and Murphy. We have detailed in this cover letter the modifications requested by the reviewers and editorial staff.

Please note that we have significantly “cut” the paper down in size per the Editor’s request to qualify as a brief report.

**Editor’s Comments (unique from Reviewers)**

Comment:  *I would be prepared to accept the paper for publication as a brief report (<1,500 words).*

Addressed: We have reduced the text (excluding Tables and References) to approximate that goal (current word count is 1643), and hope this is sufficient. We would certainly be glad to make any additional editing changes.

**Reviewer 1 Comments**

Comment:  *Poor conceptualization of ‘empowerment’...important issues around this concept such as communication, treatment choice, satisfaction are missed out.*

Addressed: The definition of empowerment has been streamlined to include these or similar elements.

Comment:  *What are the implications for the interpretation of data and the recommendations for using a 4-item scale to measure (part of) the concept of empowerment?*

Addressed: Direct implications of the results have been added to the Discussion. We have also added appropriate limitations in the Discussion to address the items and scales used in the study.
Comment: In the abstract, I prefer to see some actual implications.

Addressed: Implications have been added to the Abstract.

Comment: You may avoid including references in the abstract.

Addressed: Done.

Comment: Aims of the paper should appear at the end of the Introduction.

Addressed: Done

Comment: Reference to Strull has no date.

Addressed: Fixed

Comment: Although I appreciate that numbers are small, would be interesting to know if there are any differences between the different racial groups.

Addressed: Such an analysis was completed, and no group differences were noted. A note regarding this finding may be found in the limitations section of the Discussion.

Comment: I would suggest leaving out Table 1 as you are just repeating the same information provided in the text.

Addressed: Done

Comment: Some correlations are really low (i.e., r = .29) and we shouldn’t make too much out of it really.

Addressed: We respectfully disagree with this comment. According to Cohen (1992 – A power primer. Psychological Bulletin, 112, 155-159), correlations which approach .30 may be considered medium effects; hence they are of some importance.

Comment: What were the ‘seven measures’?

Addressed: The seven measures are now clearly identified.

Comment: Table 3: I had difficulties understanding this table, need to be less busy and more clear somehow.

Addressed: We have added a note at the bottom of the table to help clarify its content, and have referenced Tabachnick & Fidell (2002) for formatting
prototype. The table contains information needed to support the canonical correlation results. Since the paper length has been reduced (especially the canonical section), the current table format is really needed to justify and support the current findings.

Comment:  
  p. 14, lines 5-6: need for the references you are talking about to be cited.

Addressed: Much of this part of the Discussion has been removed.

Comment:  
  p. 14, mid par: What you are saying about compliance may be true, although recent work on adherence with antiretroviral medications suggest exactly the opposite, i.e., that a good patient-provider relationship is fundamental in improving intention nonadherence.

Addressed: Yes. We have added a reference and reworded the sentence.

Comment:  
  p.15 and abstract: not sure what you mean with the term ‘actor and situational characteristics.’

Addressed: These terms have been deleted.

Comment:  
  I would like to have seen a paragraph on study limitations.

Addressed: We have added limitations in the Discussion.

Reviewer 2 Comments

Comment:  
  I think the paper is mistitled. The title should reflect the research is on and about women.

Addressed: We have changed the title to reflect sole focus on women.

Comment:  
  I thought it curious that women and women’s issues were not addressed in the literature review. Women’s issues around health care are different from men’s. A discussion of this could offer opportunity to take a much larger contribution to the literature.

Addressed: We have added information regarding women’s health care in the Introduction.

Comment:  
  The work by Dale Brashers appears to be relevant to this piece and should be examined.

Addressed: We appreciate the Brashers reference, and have included his work in the manuscript.
Comment: First sentence on page 3 is confusing to me. What kind of trend are you referring to? What do you mean by power has segued from healthcare provider to patient? Where is the evidence of this?

Addressed: The ‘segue’ comment has been removed from the Introduction. Further, the definition of empowerment has been streamlined.

Comment: Patient recruitment was confusing.

Addressed: We have clarified (briefly) the Method on this point. Given space limitation, however, we have now provided two references which provide much more detail on protocols (Murphy et al, in press-a,b).

Comment: I’m very confused about the terminology of this paper. The paper is about empowerment but the measure...appears to measure what someone wants to do verses empowered to do.

Addressed: This is an excellent point. The four decision-making statements have been clarified in the Method and Results. Patients were asked at what level do they agree with each statement – hence, these items reflect how patients see themselves (agreeing or disagreeing with each statement), not behavioral intent.

Comment: I do also do not agree that the statement “Friend/family member recommended my primary care provider” is active...the discussion of the results of this study would hinge on this being clarified.

Addressed: We reconsidered the importance this section, and subsequently removed the section.

Comment: What type of discriminant analysis was performed and was the sample size adequate for the choice?

Addressed: We have removed this section.

Comment No limitations? I think there are plenty that should be discussed.

Addressed: We have added limitations to the Discussion.
We hope we have addressed the concerns of the reviewers. The suggested changes have greatly enhanced the original manuscript.

Sincerely,

William D. Marelich, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Psychology
CSU Fullerton
Box 6846
Fullerton, CA  92834
(714) 278-7374
wmarelich@fullerton.edu

Enclosures