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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor, Dear Liam Messin,

We are herewith resubmitting the revised original manuscript ‘Development of an e-learning prototype for assessing occupational stress-related disorders: a qualitative study.’

This paper has undergone a second revision in line with the reviewers’ suggestions.

Please find attached to this letter a detailed reaction setting out how we have dealt with the reviewer’s comments as requested in your e-mail 1th March 2019 (subject: submission to BMC Medical Education -MEED-D-18-00822).

We hope this paper is now suitable for publication in BMC Medical Education.

Looking forward to your reply.

Yours sincerely, also on behalf of my co-authors,
Responses to the comments from the reviewer on Manuscript MEED-D-18-00822: ‘Development of an e-learning prototype for assessing occupational stress-related disorders: a qualitative study.’ Below are the editors’ and reviewers’ remarks and suggestions stated in italics followed by our statements on how the manuscript has been changed accordingly (see ►).

Editors

The 'Ethical approval and consent to participate' statement suggests that this study protocol was not assessed by an Ethics Committee/Institutional Review Board. We would ask that you contact such a group now, local to your University, to confirm that this study would not have required ethical approval.

► The research was conducted in accordance with the declaration of Helsinki. The study protocol did not meet the criteria of the “Medical-scientific research with human participants Act”, i.e. it was not a study of a medical nature and the participants are no subject to procedures or are required to follow rules of behaviour [CCMO (Central Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects)]. So, ethical approval was not necessary to require for this study, and therefore we did not ask for ethical approval. We stated this also clearly in the document. For a later similar project amongst occupational physicians, we asked for ethical approval (for publication purposes in advance), and there the same statement was made that it was not a study of a medical nature and the participants are no subject to procedures or are required to follow rules of behaviour [CCMO (Central Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects)].
Reviewer #1

1. Box 1 is not currently referenced in the text. Box 1 should be referenced at the first point where the six step process is mentioned (line 68 to 70).

   ► Thank you for your comment; we agree with your statement and made a reference to Box 1 (see line 70).

2. Line 71: Alter "preventative advices" to "preventative advice".

   ► We rephrased the term according to you suggestion.

3. At the end of the second paragraph (line 100), a more explicit description of the purpose of the e-learning program should be provided (e.g., "The overall purpose of the e-learning program was to support OPs knowledge of and compliance with the six steps included in the evidence based guide.

   ► Thanks for your comment; we agree and added this sentence almost literally (see line 100 – 102)

4. Line 103 to 104: "perceived as" can be removed, as earlier in the sentence this is implied by "user's perspectives"

   ► We agree and removed “perceived as”.

5. The brief description of participants presented in line 138-139 can be removed, as this information is already presented in the results section.

   ► Thanks; we removed this description.

6. Line 175 - readers should be pointed to Table 1 for a detailed overview of participant demographics.

   ► Thank you for your comment. We added this in line 176 – 177.
7. Line 175 - with the addition of Table 1, the themes and subthemes are now presented in
Tables 2 and 3, these are still referred to as Table 1 and 2 in this section.

► Thanks; we corrected this part.

8. Line 341 - change "participants are no subject to…” to "participants are not subject to…”

► We rephrased the term according to your comment.

9. Table 1 should be altered so that demographic characteristics are presented in one
column, currently there are essentially two columns in this table with leads to problems with
interpretation of the data.

► Thanks for your comment; we agree and altered the table in line with your suggestion.

10. I have made a few comments about minor amendments to be made to the manuscript
later, but my most overarching comment is similar to one that I made in my first review: the
contribution that this manuscript makes to the broader research literature. In its current form, the
paper is clear and accurately addresses the research questions as set out. However, the findings
are very specific to the e-learning package under examination. This means that the results do not
really have applicability outside of the current project. Apart from combining this paper with a
paper reporting on other stages of the development and refinement process, then there is not
much that can be done to this specific manuscript. Therefore the decision whether to publish will
be a predominantly editorial one.

► We understand your comment. Apart from the changes we made accordingly during the first
review, we added new literature to support the implications of our study for the broader field of
medical education (See the discussion section, line 267 – 272). Since e-learning can contribute to
the implementation of guidelines in health care, our study contributes to this research area.