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Reviewer's report:

**Major Revision:**

Have you considered the confounding effects that may have arisen from the fact that some of the interns in the second year were supervised/influenced by those who had gone through the intervention in year one (assuming that there is significant contact between 1’s & 2’s in your program? If not, would just clarify so that readers understand this point.

In light of the short intervention, it probably would have been surprising to see a significant effect. The end-points you were measuring are impressive. But a sentence or two in the discussion regarding the fact that you don’t know what the intervention group was doing with the information gathered in comparison to controls. This is would be extremely difficult to assess but is probably the ultimate benefit of the intervention and could have potentially have been missed.

**Minor Essential Revision:**

Suggest replacing ‘before-after studies’ paragraph 2, pg 3 with something more conventional (e.g. pre- and post-testing)

**Discretionary Revision:** Consider adding another reference that is somewhat complimentary to your approach but with different outcomes. Thomas KG, Thomas MR, York EB, Dupras DM, Schultz HJ, Kolars JC. Teaching Evidence-Based Medicine to Internal Medicine Residents: A Comparison of two Learning Formats. Teach Learn Med. 2005 Spring;17(2):130-5.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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