Reviewer's report

Title: The information sources and journals consulted or read by UK paediatricians to inform their clinical practice and those which they consider important: a questionnaire survey.

Version: 2 Date: 9 November 2006
Reviewer: Andrew Riordan

Reviewer's report:

General
The paper has been altered, but not all my previous comments have been acted on. It is still not of a length or style that would usually be published in a Paediatric Journal.
The improvements needed would be;

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
The improvements needed would be;
1. Writing style and format. The paper is too long (especially the discussion section). There is little real information in the results section and an extremely limited statistical analysis. I would again suggest the authors seek advice from someone used to writing papers for paediatric journals.
2. Introduction. This focuses on Journals and impact factors. However the study is about sources of information Paediatricians’ say they use. The introduction should focus on this.
3. Results. Despite the huge tables and graphs, there is little real information in this section. The data needs to be presented in the text in summary form with relevant statistics. The important findings are that meetings, journals and colleagues are said to be used most often. The differences between hospital and community, academic vs. non-academic, DGH vs. Tertiary etc needs to be shown statistically. If it’s not statistically significant, then the data is not worth including.
4. Discussion this is far too long. The conclusions are just a summary of the results. Again advice from someone used to writing medical papers would be useful.
5. Conclusion. The conclusion in the abstract is not supported by the data. The study shows that paediatricians say they update their knowledge mostly by meeting, journals and colleagues. The conclusion is that Paediatricians need a variety of ways of CPD.
6. Tables. These show more than those journals read by >10% respondents. The journals read by >10% of specialists isn’t very relevant -unless they can prove there are significant differences here. Table 2 and 3 could be combined.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
The phrase “consulted or attended” could be replaced by “used”.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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: No