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Hans Zauner, PhD
Editorial Office
BMC Medical Education

Re: Revision – Identifying outcome-based indicators and developing a curriculum for a continuing medical education programme on rational prescribing using a modified Delphi process

MS: 1331383761738392

Dear Dr. Zauner,

Thank you for your letter dated 18th of April, 2008 regarding our manuscript and for the comments from the reviewers. We have revised the manuscript accordingly, and in the attached response letter we have responded to each of the comments and also shown the changes we have made in the text.

We have also added a statement about ethical approval which was received from appropriate ethical committee in Iran as the final paragraph under the heading Methods.

“Ethical approval for the study was received from the Ethical Vetting Committee of the Iranian Ministry of Health and Medical Education. Informed consent was given through agreeing to participate in the different phases of the study.”

We hope that the corrections we have made will meet your requirements for publication.

On behalf of all the authors

Yours sincerely,

Hamideh M. Esmaily
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM REVIEWERS
MS: 1331383761738392
MS TITLE: Identifying outcome-based indicators and developing a curriculum for a continuing medical education programme on rational prescribing using a modified Delphi process

Responses to the comments from Dr. Anne Hesketh:

First, we would like to thank you for your comments and the clarifications that you have helped us to make during this process. We have now made further changes which we hope will improve the flow of the paper and how the reader will understand how the course was developed. We present these changes below in connection with the suggestions that have been made.

1. “I think that ‘inform’ still needs further stressed in the method as well as the discussion. This would help alleviate the jump from Delphi to curriculum which I originally found difficult”

In the Methods section, in the first paragraph under the heading Developing the content, we have changed the second sentence, beginning “They identified educational topics…” to:

“They identified educational topics for an outcome-based CME program in rational prescribing informed by the list of outcomes and outcome indicators that were developed from the second Delphi round.”

2. “In addition I feel a little smoothing out of this issue is still needed in the discussion. As it stands para 5 ends with the question ‘Why wasn’t ADR identified as an outcome?’ Para 6 goes on to say why ADRs are in the curriculum. The question is not answered until para 7. I feel the discussion around the transition from Deplhi to curriculum needs smoothed out.”

We agree that this transition should be improved and have developed the segue between paragraphs 5 and 6 as well as the opening sentences of paragraphs 6 and 7.

At the end of paragraph 5 we have added:

“Possible explanations are on the one hand that tradition prevailed and on the other that the specific construction of the task for the Delphi rounds had a decisive influence.”

At the beginning of paragraph 6 we have added:

“Regarding the first explanation, ”

And at the beginning of paragraph 7 we have changed the opening sentence to:

“The other more distinct and plausible explanation for why the initial Delphi process did not elicit a topic that content developers deemed essential could be due to the formulation of the instructions for the Delphi process.”