Author’s response to reviews

Title: Evaluation of an inter-professional workshop to develop a psychosocial assessment and child-centred communication training programme for paediatricians in training

Authors:

Debra Nestel (d.nestel@imperial.ac.uk)
Sharon Taylor (sharontaylor_2000@yahoo.com)
Quentin Spender (quentin.spender@btinternet.com)

Version: 3 Date: 25 October 2004

Author’s response to reviews: see over
Reviewer 1: Joan Simons

Responses in bullet points and italics after reviewer’s comments

**Minor Essential Revisions**

Why were only half the applicants selected for the workshop, and how did you select the successful candidates?

- “Participants were chosen from twice the number of applicants to represent a balance of disciplines and geographical spread. Selection within these criteria was made on the order of receipt of applications. Numbers were limited by the capacity of the College facilities.” (p 6)

How was the content of the workshop decided upon?

- “These aims reflected the preliminary work that the Project team had undertaken as well as their areas of content expertise.” (p 6)

The expectations should state 28.6%. This was a typographical error. I appreciate it being noted. (p 12 & p 15)

Could nurses have deemed the evaluation not relevant to them?

- “The responses may not represent the diversity of opinions expressed during the workshop nor were the professional groups equally represented in responses. For example, no nurses completed the pre workshop evaluation form. It is unclear why this was the case as all respondents were equally encouraged to complete the form.” (p 17)

How well informed were the candidates of the content of the workshop?

- “The invitation stated that the workshop would elicit the views of an interprofessional group interested in developing a training programme to improve
psychosocial assessment and child-centred communication skills of doctors.”

(p 6)

• “Although the invitation outlined the purpose of the workshop, participants came with varied views that to some extent reflected their level of experience, their unique professional perspective and their interpretation of the information provided in the invitation.” (p 15)