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Reviewer's report:

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.

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.

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).

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.

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?

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.

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 different responses. This is especially important for the likert scale questions but also applies to the codes for the qualitative responses.

Thank you.
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