Reviewer's report

Title: Effect of an institutional development plan for user participation on professionals’ knowledge, practice, and attitudes. A controlled study.

Version: 2 Date: 23 August 2011

Reviewer: Barbara Stringer

Reviewer's report:

This version of the manuscripts is considerably improved compared to the previous version. It is much more readable and has a better focus. However, I still do have some comments, mostly regarding the discussion section.

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. I still hold the opinion that the validation of the CPQ should be considered as a major limitation. Due to the fact that you did not perform factor analyses to test the subscales of the CPQ, you do not know if the CPQ measures the concepts you expect it to measure. Besides, the sensitivity of the CPQ for change over time is not known.

2. At page 18 you refer to challenges in evaluating user participation. You mention some methods for evaluation research, but it is not clear how this is related to your own study. Could you elaborate this?

3. At page 19 some other instruments are mentioned for measuring user participation. But in my opinion this section could be deleted. ‘The CPQ has been modified into….. ‘until ‘would strengthen this research area’.

Minor Essential Revisions
1. In the abstract (p.2) ‘object’ should be changed in ‘objective’

2. P. 4 the last sentence of the first paragraph might be changed in ‘the professionals are thus vital in enhancing user participation…..’.

3. P. 5 the last sentence of the second paragraph might be changed in ‘There exists thus a lack of controlled studies…..’.

4. I would advise to choose another word for ‘exercising’ (P. 5, second sentence of the third paragraph).
Discretionary Revisions

1. The content of the implementation plan for enhancing user participation was based on knowledge of the project group members. I wonder if there has been performed a literature study before the project starts after effective interventions to enhance user involvement.

2. At page 16 it is stated that all employees are invited for this study, including administrative employees. Arguments for this choice are not given. I would be curious what happened with the results if you made subgroup analyses with only those who are directly working with patients. Have you done these subgroup analyses and what were the effects on the results?
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**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published
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