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Revision Letter

Date: 22 september 2015

Dear editor,

We thank you for re-assessing our manuscript. We appreciated your comments and addressed all revision suggestions in the manuscript. We copied each comment and responded point by point as you suggested. We referred to revisions in the manuscript by page and line numbers. Changes in the manuscript are printed in bold.

On behalf of all authors,

sincerely,

Marjo Maas: marjo.maas@han.nl

1. Editor’s comment

Don’t start a sentence with a abbreviation, spell it out e.g. line 100, 132, ets (check the complete document)

Response: all abbreviations at the start of a sentence are spelled out.
Manuscript revision: all revisions throughout the manuscript are in bold.


Response: I forgot the word ‘guidelines’.
Manuscript revision: Line 75

Clinical practice guidelines are intended to optimize patient care and improve patient outcomes [1].

3. Editor’s comment


Response: Manuscript revised: Line 80

‘a study by Rutten et al.’

4. Editor’s comment

Line 121: delete the ?(communities of practice)? as it is repeat text
Response:
We apologize for these unnecessary mistakes. We removed this part in line 121.

5. Editor's comment
Line 207: should Table 3 be Table 4?, as Table 4 summarises the qualitative data, check the other table references in the text. You need to review your table order in the text as table 3 should be before table 2, table ordering should be sequential.

Response:
This comment is correct. We deleted ‘table 3’ in line 207. We added table 4 in line 237 (printed in bold). We checked the other table references. Table ordering is now sequential.

6. Editor's comment
Line 474: lower case ?c? for ?Communities?

Response:
The PROOF-reading reviewer suggested the capital ‘C’. However, publications on ‘communities of practice’ do not show this capital C. Thus we replaced all the unnecessary capital C’s. Revisions are printed in bold.

7. Editor's comment
Line 491: replace ?of? with ?undertaken by

Response:
We revised the manuscript as you suggested in line 490. The revision is printed in bold.

8. Additional revision.
We noticed an annoying error in the abstract (doubling text).
Original abstract section: “A previously published randomized controlled trial showed that PA was more effective to improve knowledge and guideline-consistent reasoning than the usual strategy “case discussion” in improving knowledge, communication, and hands-on clinical skills consistent with guideline recommendations for the management of low back pain”.

A previously published randomized controlled trial showed that PA was more effective than the usual strategy “case discussion” in improving adherence to a low back pain guideline. Peer assessment aims to enhance knowledge, communication, and hands-on clinical skills consistent with guideline recommendations.”

9 Additional revision
We noticed another error in the methods section (double words).
Original methods section
“An online questionnaire was administered after completion of the PA program. After the program was finished a questionnaire was administered in which participants were asked to rank the program tasks from high to low learning value, assigning the highest rank for the most learning value and the lowest rank for the least”. 

Revised methods section: line 166 – 168.

“An online questionnaire was administered after completion of the PA program in which participants were asked to rank the program tasks from high to low learning value, assigning the highest rank for the most learning value and the lowest rank for the least”. 

We hope that you can approve of these revisions.