Reviewer's report

Title: E-assessment of prior learning: A model for interactive systematic assessment of staff with no formal education who are working in Swedish elderly care

Version: 3
Date: 27 February 2014

Reviewer: Joseph Wherton

Reviewer's report:

- Many of the responses to the major revision relate to expansion of study ‘limitations’ and future development on this work – Therefore, I would present this paper as a preliminary/proof-of-concept study, rather than a model. The paper is currently entitled ‘A model for interactive assessment of staff’. However, given the single locality of this research, study limitations and further work to be completed, I would suggest the title “a pilot study for interactive assessment’. I think the authors offer interesting insights into the feasibility of e-assessment methods in elder care, but I do not feel that it is at a stage where we can confidently present is as model of good practice or transferable to other services. I think this also needs to be reflected in the abstract.

- The ‘Results’ section appears to merge with the procedure/description of the e/learning model. I think this would need to be restructured with these two aspects in separate sections - 1) overview of the e-assessment model/procedure)and 2) results from this particular study.

- The authors refer to the Mann-Whitney U tests in the discussion, but the statistics for this test needs to be included in the Results Section – giving the test and p values.

- It states that the e-assessment tool was ‘tested’ through a user-centred approach. I am not clear what this means. Do the authors mean it was ‘developed’ through a user-cantered approach - I think this needs more explanation if it was ‘tested’ using this approach.

- The figures within Fig 3 (located inside the bars) are difficult to read – I would suggest a different format to represent these.

- I am still confused as to how the authors determined the efficacy of the ICT-based approach over current methods of training. I think this paper focuses more on the users’ experience and engagement with the system, rather than comparing it to alternative approaches. I wonder if this paper should focus more on the user-centred design and piloting aspects of this work (e.g. practicalities of conducting e-assessment), rather than ‘testing the model’ as described in the abstract.
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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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