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Effective In-Service Training Design and Delivery: Evidence from an Integrative Review of the Literature Julia Bluestone, Peter Johnson, Judith Fullerton, Catherine Carr, Jessica Alderman and James BonTempo

We are grateful for the very positive reviews of this manuscript. We have revised the manuscript in response to essentially all of the several helpful editorial suggestions offered by reviewers. Our exceptions, with rationale, are specifically noted in the table that follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer Comment</th>
<th>Our response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referee 1: Stated a systematic review should have been done.</td>
<td>The suggestion to conduct a systematic review is not appropriate, as it would greatly limit the information that we would have been able to include in our review (as many techniques have not been studied/reported in systematic reviews) and therefore we would have been unable to draw any inference about several approaches to CPE. We deliberately conducted an integrative review because it offered the added advantages noted here. This approach was supported by the other 3 reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referee 1: Asked for citation in background regarding the need to expand beyond traditional, classroom based training.</td>
<td>Our assertion here is based upon Jhpiego’s experience in more than 150 countries over the past 40 years. Through our work, coalition work and partnership with other organizations, we see a global trend and interest in alternative methodologies and approaches that warrant exploration and a review of the evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referee 1: suggested ‘timing’ be defined as ‘frequency’</td>
<td>Selected questions and terminology were based on the systematic review performed by the Johns Hopkins University Evidence Based Practice Center definition of terms produced in 2009 requesting consistent terminology use regarding evaluations of continued health professional education. We could have selected frequency instead, but we define the term ‘timing’ clearly and therefore retain it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referee 1: suggests that conclusions are not obviously supported by the evidence</td>
<td>We acknowledge the point of his concern; however, we had stated clearly in the original manuscript that we made no attempt to conduct additional peer review of published studies; rather we accepted the conclusions exactly as stated by the authors. Therefore we reject the opinion of this reviewer that our findings are not supported by the evidence. The other three reviewers did not express that concern.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We trust that we have responded appropriately to each concern, and look forward to publication of this article.
Best professional regards,

Julia Bluestone, CNM, MS
Senior Technical Advisor
Global Learning Office, Jhpiego
1615 Thames St, Baltimore MD 21231