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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

Thank you for your time and insight. We have given your comments thorough consideration and revised accordingly. The followings are our point to point responses, the underlined statements, to your comments.

Editorial comments:

1. Ethics

Please provide a statement detailing if review and approval by an ethics committee was needed for this study. If it was, please provide the full name and affiliation of the committee that approved this study. If it was not needed, please provide a reason as to why this was the case.

Ethical approval was obtained for this study. Ethical approval was granted for this study by the Saint Lucia Medical and Dental Council on 9th August, 2011. We have added this statement on p.5 under the heading study design.

2. Authors contributions

Please detail the specific contributions of each author in this section. Please also include a statement to the effect ‘all authors read and approved the final version of this manuscript’.
Have revised as suggested.

3. Figures

Please remove the legends from your figure files and include them separately at the end of your manuscript file.

Have revised as suggested.

4. Appendix

Please upload your appendix as a supplementary file to which you refer to in the text.

Have revised as suggested.

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer #1:

Abstract: please, include the study design. The conclusion of the abstract should be strictly supported by data presented in the abstract - please align this.

Have revised as suggested.

Background: I am not sure that I find lines 1-19 relevant; it is too local and too detailed. Lines 21-50 lack references - please insert appropriate references to support your claims.

We have included lines 1-9 to give an indication of the type of population which we refer to. It provides readers with a more vivid context of reference to understand the type of environment, population, etc. We have also rewritten the 2nd and 3rd paragraphs under the heading background and cited more references.

Methods: start by presenting the study design followed by a presentation of the instrument - it could be beneficial to use sub-headings. The presentation of the respondents could be organized
more logically: start with the included centres, then the stratified sampling and then a description of the health care professionals. The sentence presenting the data collection period should follow after a presentation of the study design - in the beginning of the methods section.

The methods section was reorganized as suggested.

Results and discussion: I would highly recommend that results and discussion should be separated. It is confusing to read and furthermore, unclear precisely what is results and what is discussion.

Results and discussion have been separated.

Conclusion: I do not find the first sentence supported by data.

We have rewritten our conclusions as well.

Reviewer #2:

1. Please rectify all grammatical mistakes.

We have undergone English editing by native speakers to rectify grammatical mistakes.

2. Clarify what is meant by "semi-opaque" and how that is established.

On page 6, we have added a reference from the original developers in the 2nd paragraph to explain what this meant.

3. Elaborate on the methods in order to ensure reproducibility. Provide more details on how the data was collected and how participants were recruited.

The methods section was reorganized as suggested.
4. Also, the methods could be clarified by adding headers and the respective information placed within each of those headers. For example, INSTRUMENT should include all details pertaining to the metric, PROCEDURE would include details of how the metric was administered, etc.

Headers were added as suggested.

--------------------
Editorial Requests
--------------------

Please note that all submissions to BMC Medical Education must comply with our editorial policies. Please read the following information and revise your manuscript as necessary. If your manuscript does not adhere to our editorial requirements this will cause a delay whilst the issue is addressed. Failure to adhere to our policies may result in rejection of your manuscript.

Ethics:

If your study involves humans, human data or animals, then your article should contain an ethics statement which includes the name of the committee that approved your study.

If ethics was not required for your study, then this should be clearly stated and a rationale provided.

Ethical approval was obtained for this study. Ethical approval was granted for this study by the Saint Lucia Medical and Dental Council on 9th August, 2011. We have added this statement on p.5 under the heading study design.

Consent:

If your article is a prospective study involving human participants then your article should include a statement detailing consent for participation.
If individual clinical data is presented in your article, then you must clarify whether consent for publication of these data was obtained.

This is not a clinical trial. All respondents were voluntary and we did not include any personal information.

Availability of supporting data:

BioMed Central strongly encourages all data sets on which the conclusions of the paper rely be either deposited in publicly available repositories (where available and appropriate) or presented in the main papers or additional supporting files, in machine-readable format whenever possible. Authors must include an Availability of Data and Materials section in their article detailing where the data supporting their findings can be found. The Accession Numbers of any nucleic acid sequences, protein sequences or atomic coordinates cited in the manuscript must be provided and include the corresponding database name.

Will take this under consideration.

Authors Contributions:

Your 'Authors Contributions' section must detail the individual contribution for each individual author listed on your manuscript.

Have revised as suggested.