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Reviewer’s report:

General
This is an interesting article and reads well.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

---

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
1. in several places throughout the text (page 2, 7,8), the authors make statements such as 'graduates tended to value patient choice and clinical judgement above EBM'. this is confusing b/c the definition of EBM is the integration of the best evidence with our clinical expertise and our patient's values and circumstances. so if the evidence doesn't fit with our patient's values, we wouldn't apply the evidence but that's still practising EBM. i think they should change the phrase to 'tended to value patient choice and clinical judgement above the EVIDENCE'

2. were the EBM workshops mandatory?

3. did the survey ask about clinical research exposure or any research experience?

4. in the conclusions, the authors suggest that educators consider their results when creating educational interventions - could they provide clarification/advice on what they mean by this? how would teachers use the information from this paper? should we be teaching surgeons and medics differently for example? men and women differently:)

5. there are also some typos in the manuscript including page 4, para 1, line 1 - don't need to capitalise 'quality'

---

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential 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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