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Reviewer's report:

The authors should be congratulated for their amazing efforts at collaborating across several countries in an educational intervention. It is a great achievement to bring this many people together.

Some suggestions that they may consider to further strengthen their manuscript:

Major revisions:
1. was their questionnaire validated prior to implementation in this study?
2. was the content in the sessions discipline specific given the various clinical disciplines of the participants?
3. did all the facilitators receive the same training?
4. how were participants recruited to the sessions? was participation mandatory?
5. could additional details be provided on the participants including their level of training, age, years since graduation, and the extent of previous EBM training?
6. could they clarify, were the pre and post-questionnaires completed on the same day? Have they done further follow-up to look at behaviours or if knowledge changed over time?
7. who scored the tests? Were the assessors blinded to pre/post status of the participants?
8. the knowledge changes are statistically significant, but are they clinically/educationally significant?
9. on page 12, the authors state that this course is likely to be successful in provision of a competency certification in EBM â## does this mean that they believe this level of change indicates competency?
10. could they provide a description of their next steps? For example, given the collaborations they have achieved, do they plan to evaluate their educational intervention in an randomized trial and to determine the impact on behaviours and other outcomes?

Minor suggestions:
1. there are a few typos etc that could be fixed in the next version

It will be interesting to see the next steps from this collaborative network.
**Which journal?**: Appropriate or potentially appropriate for BMC Medicine: an article of importance in its field

**What next?**: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

**Quality of written English**: Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review**: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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