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The Editor
BMC Medical Education

23 December 2018

MEED-D-18-00666

Dear Editor,

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

We are grateful for really valuable comments made by the Referees 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 publication.

The manuscript has gone through a new language review of a language specialist

Please below, find our specific answers to the comments made by the Editor and the Referees:
Technical Comments:

(1) Please include the email addresses of all authors on the title page. Please ensure that it is identical to the one entered on the submission system.

Our response: E-mail addresses of all authors are included on the title page.

(2) Please include an abstract as the second page in your manuscript file (directly following the title page). In addition, the abstract must be structured into separate sections with the appropriate subheadings:
- Background: the context and purpose of the study
- Methods: how the study was performed and statistical tests used
- Results: the main findings
- Conclusions: brief summary and potential implications

Our response: The abstract is now included as the second page.

(3) Please change the heading 'Introduction' to 'Background' within your manuscript.

Our response: The heading “Introduction” is now changed to “Background”.

(4) Please provide a list of all the abbreviations used in the manuscript. This list should be placed just before the Declarations section. All abbreviations should still be defined in the text at first use.

Our response: A list of abbreviations is placed just before the Declarations section.
(5) Please note that all manuscripts must contain all the following sections under the heading 'Declarations'. The Declarations should follow the List of Abbreviations section, and be before the References.
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If any of the sections are not relevant to your manuscript, please include the heading and write 'Not applicable' for that section.

Our response: A section of “Declarations” with mandatory sections is included under the list of abbreviations.

Reviewer reports:
Dunja Degmecic (Reviewer 1):

Paper named "Combining learning for educators and participants in a paediatric CPD programme" is dealing with the interesting and important topic, introduction, aim, methods, results, discussion and conclusion are written adequately and substantiated with literature quotes.

Ian Munabi, M.D Ph.D. (Reviewer 2): Dear Editor,
Thank you for this very interesting manuscript, kindly allow me to express the following concerns:

1. Overall I think there is need for more detailed description of the links between what was done and the adult learning theory. To aid this I suggest the authors re-read their core citation (Taylor and Hamdee, 2013), which sets out several old and more recent theories of adult learning, with the aim of selecting the most appropriate theory to guide the work in this manuscript. A paragraph detailing these linkage would make for more focused reading of the manuscript.

   Our answer: A new paragraph is added to the Background: page 6, line 3-14.

2. In my opinion the absence of comparison group data that may be available from the reported previous trainings greatly weakens the authors presentation. Was consideration made to use a pre and post test approach to evaluating the intervention? if not an explanation would have been helpful.

   Our answer: There was no previous trainings. The design of the study has been clarified under Methods: page 7, line 9-14 and page 7, line 22 to page 8, line 1-8.

3. I note that there were an 2 initial days of lectures (a description to cover: lecture schedule, summary content and method of delivery is needed for these(see doi: 10.1080/17404622.2010.490232)), that were followed by the student centered case based scenario discussions. On this note a detailed description of the sessions would help to provide information on the lectures given, how they were given as has been done for the case discussions (see page 6).

   Our answer: There was just half a day of lectures followed by one and a half days of case discussions. The alleged part of the manuscript has been clarified: page 9, line 14-19.

4. There is no detailed information on the participants. in the abstract there are 7 participants from another course and 27 nurses and pediatricians. How old were these individuals, what was their level of education, how many CPD hours had done, did any of them have any educational
training? The context specific nature of educational interventions makes it important to provide this missing information so that the reader follow and possibly transfer the lessons learned to other contexts.

Our answer: The design of the study has been clarified under Methods: page 7, line 9-14 and page 7, line 22 to page 8, line 1-8.

5. An additional concern with respect to numbers is that there were two courses mentioned in the abstract. This becomes one in the methods, what happened to the "7 out of 10" individuals? was this a pilot? how does that course compare with the one the 27 participants went through?

Our answer: The design of the study has been clarified under Methods: page 7, line 9-14 and page 7, line 22 to page 8, line 1-8.

6. There is need to provide detailed information on the list of questions used and a description of how the authors selected or created them, more so since the tools used are not validated tools. Adding a section on questionnaire of tool development would greatly help future readers. Also a more detailed summary of the responses either as text or a proper table would further clarify the presentation of this.

Our answer: A section on questionnaire of tool development is added: page 10, line 20 – page 11, line 1-3.

We think that the supplementary section along with Table 2 clarifies the tools we used. According to our opinions, another table would just overload the manuscript without getting it clearer or providing any new information.

7. This being a mixed methods study the absence of a clear table of frequencies makes it difficult to appreciate the weightings of the different responses. This is especially important for the likert scale questions but also applies to the codes for the qualitative responses.
Our answer: We are aware of the complexity of our study and the using of “mixed methods” making it difficult to appreciate the weightings of the different responses. However, we do not think that another table, a table of frequencies would provide enough information to justify to be included. There were just two “likert scale questions” and applicable numbers to the qualitative responses are illustrated in Table 3 (items).

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