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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting report on the evaluation of an electronic teaching resource that centres around the format of delivery against a number of outcomes. It was not until I got to the details of the methodology that it became apparent who the professional group was that the authors studied, and whilst it may not be absolutely relevant to the outcome I think that it would be useful to include the professional group and level of educational input (i.e. postgraduate specialised training) in both the title and the abstract.

There is some use of terminology that not all readers will be instantly aware of (e.g. VoIP) that may benefit from a minimal level of detail (and at least expansion of the acronym.

The background was a little repetitive - but overall managed to put the study into context using appropriate references.

The results would benefit from denominators for the respondents from the population (or percentage) in the main text (although I understand that these are given in the tables these are not always adjacent in the text versions).

The 2 slight revisions that I think may be worthwhile making to the paper are as follows.

As a reviewer one has to read the paper fairly carefully - I think that it would benefit the reader to be told a little more about the recruitment of the individuals for these trials and also of the differences between the 2 groups in terms of knowledge. This is because it is only when the results show a difference in knowledge between the 2 groups in terms of pre-test assessments that one could argue that despite the apparent similarities between the 2 groups demonstrated by the participant characteristics on the Chi squared comparisons (TABLE 2), there are actually quite significant knowledge differences between participants in the SGL (higher knowledge) compared to on demand (lower knowledge). (I also note the minor point that due to the nature of the study the on demand groups were all included at least 2 years after the SGL groups - and the authors do not mention the fact that perceptions and knowledge may change over time as a confounding factor).

The second issue that I think needs to be made explicit, is the fact that not only is the confidence higher in SGL, but that the ratings in the on demand group decrease. This strengthens the argument, and although this finding is not
statistically significant, an adequately powered study may find that on demand CME eLearning formats may be destructive to learning. This would be important to know.
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