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“Effectiveness of a Computer Assisted Learning (CAL) package to raise awareness of autism”

Dear Professor Norton,

Thank you very much for the very helpful and constructive comments from the reviewers regarding the above manuscript. I have attached the revised manuscript which includes a detailed report of how we addressed each of the reviewer’s comments. We hope that our response have satisfactorily answered all the queries by the reviewers. We are grateful to you for providing us with an opportunity to reply to the reviewers.

Yours sincerely,

Jariya Chuthapisith

Department of Pediatrics
Faculty of Medicine Ramathibodi Hospital
Mahidol University
Bangkok 10400 Thailand
Reviewer: Tobias Bernd Weberschock

Q1. I would suggest to include test name and the results from the test on normal distribution in the paper.

We used the Shapiro-Wilks W test to test the normality of distribution. In the revised manuscript, we have incorporated the test name for normality of distribution of the data on page 7. As well, the results of the test are included on page 7. These have been highlighted for the benefit of the reviewer.

Page 7
The Shapiro-Wilks W test was used to test normality of distribution.

Page 7
According to the Shapiro-Wilks W test, the assumptions of normality of retention performance score, level of enjoyment and level of confidence to identify a child as autism were met (W=0.932, 0.945 and 0.956, respectively).

Q2. The question posed at the end of the introduction might be misleading, since the paper is not about the development of the CAL package but about an intervention RCT with two groups with one group receiving this package. So the sentence "As well, the effectiveness of the CAL package in providing essential information about autism was evaluated." is the real main research question. Furthermore the comparison "information leaflet" and the main parameter for efficacy (1 of the 3 as previously chosen) are missing in the question.

We thank and agree with the reviewer for the comments above. As a result, the sentences at the end of the introduction have been changed. The new sentence is on page 4 and is highlighted for the benefit of the reviewer. Also, the title of the research has been modified to “Effectiveness of a Computer Assisted Learning (CAL) package to raise awareness of autism”, in order to be compatible with the main research question.
The aim of the study is, therefore, to evaluate the effectiveness (in terms of providing essential information about autism, users’ level of enjoyment and users’ level of confidence to identify a child with autism) of the CAL package, comparing with the information leaflet.

Reviewer: Julie Hadley

There are still a number of spelling mistakes and grammatical errors which need to be addresses for example “…..in educating persons who work with children…”

The revised manuscript has been proofread and corrected by a native English speaker.

As a result, “….in educating persons who work with children….” on page 4 has been changed.

“…To the author’s knowledge, there has been no published study examining the use of CAL package in autism.”