Author's response to reviews

Title: Assessment of higher order cognitive skills in undergraduate education: Modified Essay or Multiple Choice Questions?: Research Paper

Authors:

Edward J Palmer (edward.palmer@adelaide.edu.au)
Peter G Devitt (peter.devitt@adelaide.edu.au)

Version: 3 Date: 22 October 2007

Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Editors,

Thank you for the opportunity to have our manuscript published in BMC Medical Education. We have found the reviewers comments useful and have made the following changes in response.

We have added some extra information in the abstract, highlighting the number of items tested.

We have deleted the reference to significance at the bottom of page 4. It is not relevant to the kappa statistic.

We have renamed Figure 2 as suggested by reviewer 2 to something which we believe provides a clearer description of its meaning.

We have addressed the question of face or content validity at the top of page 6.

We have accepted the advice of reviewer 2 and modified the second to last paragraph of page 7. The paragraph now reads:

Other options to improve the testing abilities of the MCQ type of format is to use extended matching questions and uncued questions. These have been put forward as advances on the MCQ, but these test formats can be easily misused with the result that they may end up focusing only on knowledge recall.

We have applied a consistent terminology to the modified Bloom’s taxonomy we have used throughout the paper.

We are grateful to the reviewers for their efforts on reviewing this paper in great detail and believe the manuscript is far better for their input.

Kind Regards
Edward Palmer, Peter Devitt