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Author’s response to reviews:

The Editor
BMC Medical Education

17 October 2018

MEED-D-18-00666

Dear Editor,

On behalf of all the authors, we would like to re-submit our manuscript, Combining learning for educators and participants in a paediatric CPD programme, by Holmgren D et al., to BMC Medical Education as an “Article”.

We are grateful for the valuable comments made by the Editor on the manuscript and has revised the paper accordingly. We think the manuscript has improved significantly after the revision and hope that it now may be considered for peer review.

Please below, find our specific answers to the comments made by the Editor:
Comment by the Editor

The authors are to be commended for a well written paper in terms of grammar, surrounding delivery of CME, however, the paper was very difficult to read and the relationship between the education skill component and integration with the CPD learning component is still unclear despite several readings of the paper. A suitable flow chart may be useful.

Our answer

The manuscript is revised and we hope that the relationship between the education skill component and integration with the CPD learning component now is clearer.

Comment by the Editor

The aim/s need to be substantially sharpened and better defined and more clearly linked to the appropriateness of the chosen methodology.

Our answer

The aim is rewritten.

Comment by the Editor

More detail is to be provided of the pre-course needs assessment and how the label of lecture oriented educators was conceived.

Our answer

This information has now been added to the manuscript (Introduction)

Comment by the Editor

The adult learning principles to be applied to this program could be better explained in the introduction. The learning module adoption of the constructivist epistemology needs further explanation.
Our answer

The manuscript is revised accordingly (Introduction)

Comment by the Editor

The methods section is to be made far more succinct and expanded in the discussion as appropriate.

Our answer

The method section has been shortened

Comment by the Editor

Much of the evaluation of the educational skills content section of the methodology could be condensed through the attachment of the questionnaire used and the methodology/steps used in the thematic analysis need to be more explicit.

Our answer

The questionnaires have been attached as a Table (Table 2)

Comment by the Editor

Survey tool validation need to be discussed.

Our answer

Survey tool validation is now discussed (Methodological considerations).

Comment by the Editor

Similarly the results section could be made more succinct.
Our answer

The result section is now more concise

Comment by the Editor

The discussion could make a more convincing argument, based on the results, of how this piece of research can benefit other similar CPD activities beyond the current narrow context and suggest a pathway for further research in this area.

Our answer

The Discussion section has been revised accordingly.

Comment by the Editor

A better explanation, preferably with appropriate documentary support (e.g. a statement of exemption from HREC) would need to be provided as to why the study is exempted from ethical review and whether participation was voluntary and how such issues as confidentiality and consent were managed.

Our answer

Information about voluntary and confidentiality are now added.

Yours sincerely,

Daniel Holmgren, MD, PhD
Associate Professor
Director of Study for Paediatric CPD in Western Sweden
Departments of Paediatrics Skaraborg Hospital, Skövde and Gothenburg University, Sweden
Telephone +46703618750