Reviewer 1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Comments** | **Suggestions** | **Changes made** |
| **Discusses interprofessional education and then palliative care education. Ties two together nicely as they begin to discuss the act of breaking bad news with patients.** | **The definition of BBN on p. 5 doesn’t make sense. The definition provided is for a noun, not a verb. “breaking bad news” is an action. The definition provided sounds as though it is only for “bad news”. Please clarify this** | This definition has been changed and the sentence reads: Buckman, (1984) has defined breaking bad news (BBN) as delivering “any news that drastically and negatively alters the patient's view of her or his future.”  |
| **The section on Module Context which is most of p. 7 could be deleted. It doesn’t add anything to the article.****No demographics are given for student participants other than level of education and type of professional.** **Total number of participants? Both students and facilitators…****An “action research approach” was used. This needs further clarification. What exactly is this? Not all readers will be familiar with this approach.****Explanation of the pre-session interviews was a bit confusing. This section needs to be clarified.** |  | DoneDone – table insertedNumbers have been reported in the textTable inserted explaining action research approachThis has been shortened and simplified and is now clearer |
| **This section is complete, but lengthy. The report of the audio-recording could be written more concisely.** | **I do think less quotes in all data reporting sections would shorten this section a bit but still get your points across. The article is quite long. For instance, I don’t think it’s necessary to quote exactly what the facilitator states to the student participants.**  | Audio recording section and other data reporting sections shortened. Several quotes have been removed.  |
| **Well written** |  |  |
| **Some typos throughout paper need correction.**  |  | Spelling and grammar check done |
| **Too lengthy; mentioned in earlier part of review what needs to be done to shorten paper** |  | Body of article (without appendices) reduced in length from by approximately 1600 words  |

Reviewer 2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Comments | Suggestions |  |
| Study aims are defined. Rationale is defined; good definition of terms |  |  |
| Literature Review grounds study in previous research | SPIKES model needs to be elucidated briefly – there is no explanation of what SPIKES stands for. | Done – brief overview inserted in table format |
| Data collection and procedures for data analysis are described; participant selection is appropriate |  |  |
| Data is organized using themes, assertions, or models  | Be clear as to what F1, F2, S13, etc. means – I’m assuming Facilitator 1, Student 13 but you don’t tell us, so can’t be sure. IDT needs to be identified early.  | This has been clarifiedThis is identified on the 2nd page of the article |
| Discussion explains how the findings contribute to the literature. Implications for higher education classrooms in any discipline is essential; limitations noted |  |  |
|  | In the introduction there are paragraphs that consist of only citations – the authors need to include their own thoughts.APA style for citations and references is incorrect. *Also I’d be careful that they are not quoting – there are no quotes for some statements, but please check the citations that have page numbers listed – that is strange and makes me think the author does not know how to cite a quote or a paraphrase correctly*. *Plus where there are quotes, there is no page # referenced.* Author Greenhalgh is spelled incorrectly in the Plsek & Greenhalgh cite and in the reference pages. Text in tables need to be aligned in correct columns | The introduction has been modified. Referencing has been corrected to APA styleSpelling corrected to GreenhalghText in tables realigned |
| **Article is very long** = perhaps either break article up into two articles or move some of the narrative into a sidebar or appendix and make the study the focus of the article. Appendices are helpful. Definitely contributes to the SOTL and healthcare literature! | Suggest that you break this into two articles – publish the teaching methods and student feedback first and then you can refer to that article for the qualitative study article. | As suggested by the editor the article has been shortenedBody of article (without appendices) reduced in length by approximately 1600 words  |
|  |  |  |
| Important topic that fills a gap in the literature.  | Definitely publish, but perhaps as two articles.  |  |