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Reviewer's report:

1. Does the debate present a novel argument, or a novel insight into existing work? - while the argument is not novel, the conclusion about the place of evidence-based practice skills in curricula is more clearly argued than I have seen elsewhere in the literature and can be considered a novel insight. Moreover the paper is the consensus of a debate among a significant number of the leaders in academic evidence based practice teaching worldwide.

2. Does the debate address an important problem of interest to a broad biomedical audience? - yes

3. Is the piece well argued and referenced? - yes

4. Has the author used logical arguments and sound reasoning? - yes

5. Is the piece written well enough for publication? - the piece is well written and structured and does not need any further editing

Revision comments:

Discretionary Revision only suggested: the paper could be improved by at least some discussion on the type(s) of evidence most relevant to 'evidence-based practice. I assume this was discussed at the meeting that formed the basis of this paper. If so some comment should be made.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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