Author's response to reviews

Title: Using a conceptual framework during learning attenuates the loss of expert-type knowledge structure.

Authors:

   Kerry Novak (knovok@ucalgary.ca)
   Henry Mandin (henry.mandin@calgaryhealthregion.ca)
   Elizabeth Wilcox (elizabeth.wilcox@utoronto.ca)
   Kevin McLaughlin (kevin.mclaughlin@calgaryhealthregion.ca)

Version: 2 Date: 22 March 2006

Author’s response to reviews: see over
March 22, 2006

BMC Medical Education

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Using a conceptual framework during learning attenuates the loss of expert-type knowledge structure.

Thank you for the helpful reviews of this manuscript. I have addressed each of the reviewers comments as detailed below:

Reviewer: William Wattenmaker

Discretionary revision A. I have highlighted these points on page 12, paragraph 2 and again under ‘limitations’ (page 13, paragraph 2)

Discretionary revision B. More details have been added, with examples, under concept sorting (page 6, paragraph 2).

Discretionary revision C. This threshold is explained on page 7, paragraph 2.

Discretionary revision D. No action was needed for this.

Discretionary revision E. This comment has been highlighted under ‘limitations’ (page 13, paragraph 2)

Discretionary revision F. No action was needed for this.

Discretionary revision G. This question is answered in table 2.

Discretionary revision H. This has been added in figures 2 and 3.

Discretionary revision I. This comment has been added to the first paragraph (page 3, paragraph 1).
Reviewer: Kevin Ewa

Major compulsory revision 1. This comment has been added to the first paragraph and the reference by McGaghie added (page 3, paragraph 1).

Major compulsory revision 2. This comment has been highlighted under ‘limitations’ (page 13, paragraph 2).

Minor essential revision 1. This is explained on page 6, paragraph 3.

Minor essential revision 2. This is explained on page 6, paragraph 3 and page 7, paragraph 2.

Minor essential revision 3. This result has been added on page 9, paragraph 4.

Minor essential revision 4. Tables 1 and 2 now show the stratified analyses.

Discretionary revision 1. This weakness has been added to and explained in ‘limitations’ (page 13, paragraph 2).

Discretionary revision 2. The discordant pair analysis is not really a comparison of proportions and I think the use of the term ‘proportion’ would be inappropriate here. This test is comparing the number of students who changed in one direction to the number that changed in the opposite direction (those who do not change are not included in the analysis).

Discretionary revision 3. I have changed the first sentence (page 3, paragraph 1) to reflect this point.

Discretionary revision 4. This has been added on page 7, paragraph 1.

Discretionary revision 5. I have corrected the typos.

Discretionary revision 6. I have added the proportions.

I hope that I have managed to address these points to the reviewer’s satisfaction.

Thanking you in anticipation.

Yours faithfully,

Dr. Kevin McLaughlin
(Corresponding Author)