February 4, 2015

Dear Brian Beise,

We appreciate the thorough review of our manuscript. Your feedback was helpful and we have addressed all of the concerns and recommendations. We believe, as a result of your feedback we have a stronger manuscript.

Below you will find the reviewer’s feedback and our response:

* A full listing of the post evaluation questions would have provided more clarity in what was actually being analyzed.

*A list of evaluation questions has been added as an appendix.*

* No mention was made regarding the reliability of the developed instrument. If it was tested for reliability the alpha score should be reported. If the instrument was not tested, that should be considered a limitation of the study including some discussion on the potential impact of the results.

*We added a short discussion about not being able to calculate the Chronbach’s Alpha and noted that this is a limitation to the study*

* The article would be strengthened by providing a clear definition of using a “trauma sensitive lens."

*On p. 5 we provided a clearer definition of trauma sensitive lens*

* A presentation of the content of the 1 day training would provide more clarity of what information was covered.

*We added this information on p. 14.*

* You indicated that the study results provide direction of future trainings and educational opportunities for case managers. More discussion is needed to support these statements. Some discussion on how schools that do not have mental health providers or social workers available should address trauma of students needs to be presented.

*We added a section that starts on page 16 to address this*