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Reviewer’s report:

Novel Refreshers for Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation: A Randomized Controlled Trial. Miller et al.

The abstract of this paper is eye-catching. It relates to novel methods of refreshing knowledge of CPR and confidence in its use, based on technology that has develop in recent years. Results must be of interest whether the new techniques are shown to have a useful role or not.

This reviewer was therefore disappointed to find that the full paper did not provide an engaging read. Few with an interest in teaching resuscitation would persevere beyond the Background section through the 10 pages of Methods and the complex presentation of Results. The study should be written in a way that can reach this group, else it would have little value. Much work has been put into this trial, and I am truly saddened that I cannot recommend it in its present form.

The approach resembles that of a dissertation presented for an academic degree; but even for this purpose, the unnecessary repetitions would seem tedious. Much of the Methods section does not relate strictly to methods as one should expect. Statistical analysis is important but again the approach here is beyond that which is appropriate for Healthcare Professionals, suitable perhaps for a Dissertation.

I believe this basically interesting trial could be presented in less than half the number of pages taken in the article as it stands and could be much more, not less, informative as a result.

I have not attempted any detailed critique because of my belief that the format has to be changed markedly. If others agree with this view and if then the authors do decide to re-submit a shorter version, then of course I would be happy to offer more detailed comments.

I have a few points that may be worth mentioning at this time. The term ‘self-efficacy’ is confusing. I thought at first it meant ‘competence’ but it seems to mean ‘confidence’. Confidence is indeed mentioned in the second paragraph of the Background section, but I interpreted this on first-read as an additional item. The descriptions of Trial 1 and Trial 2 were unnecessarily complex, given that they were basically similar apart from the repetitions. The list of references was relatively long from a range of sources and disciplines but I found this helpful. I
checked some, not all. Most were accurate but there were minor spelling errors of names in refs 6 and 8. In reference 7, the volume number was cited incorrectly.

If a detailed critique were to be offered, it is a great help for lines to be numbered. Different computer formats make it impractical to cite comments by page number.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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