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Author's response to reviews:

Response to editors’ comments
Thank you for the suggested revisions. We have now addressed each of these in the revised manuscript and used track changes (and highlighting to distinguish from previous revisions).

1 We have revised the title to “Evaluation of an online interactive Diabetes Needs Assessment Tool (DNAT) versus online self-directed learning: A Randomised Controlled Trial”

2 We have revised the affiliation to MSD, a subsidiary of Merck & Co. Corp.

3 In the abstract, the editor has asked for a clarification on the type of survey. However, we do not feel that adding something like satisfaction survey or attitudinal survey would be beneficial. The surveys were neither of these and had a range of different types of questions. Calling it satisfaction for example implies that the questions were asking how satisfied participants were with X. We prefer to leave it as it stands as sufficient content of the surveys is provided in Table 3.

4 We have revised the text throughout so that the sentences always start with text and not numbers.

5 We have added the a reference for the statement “Currently, CPD largely relies on healthcare professionals’ self-perceived learning priorities”
Grant J. Learning needs assessment: assessing the need. BMJ 2002;324:156-9

6 “white labelled” means unbranded and we have revised the text to say:
“The system hosting the learning modules was developed and hosted by
univadis®. It was an unbranded ('white labelled') version of their website to focus learners on only the intended modules.”

7 We have removed the following statements:

“Much of the debate and research on CPD methodology has been published by educationalists in journals not often accessed by practicing clinicians. However, it is important to engage practicing clinicians in this discussion as they are the learners and their participation in this process is crucial.”

8 We have expanded the conclusions to mention the study implications