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**Reviewer's report:**

This paper is based on a questionnaire applied to a small cohort of interns in Nigerian hospitals in relation to their training in clinical pharmacology and experience as early postgraduate prescribers. This is an area of international interest and importance to public health.

The important weaknesses are:

1. The cohort studied is small.
2. The population studied seems pretty diverse, varying in their clinical experience and postgraduate activities.
3. The cohort is biased towards graduates of one or two medical schools.
4. This is entirely an opinion based study and some of the stated conclusions cannot be backed up from such a limited dataset.
5. Although the study is about CPT education we learn little about the actual education delivered to the study cohort.
6. I don't think the limitations of the work are properly acknowledged.

More minor criticisms:

1. The paper suggests there were interviews but then implies questionnaires were taken away and filled out.
2. We never get to see the questions posed.
3. Some of the references are incorrect and don't seem to back up the points being made.
4. It's difficult to see how the authors conclude in the abstract that their findings suggest the adoption of a problem-based curriculum.

The authors describe this as pilot data and I think that is really the extent of it at present but I think they can use their data to justify a much larger Nigerian study.

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

The questionnaire should be included.

The limitations of the study should be stated.

The conclusions should be reviewed in the light of the findings.
Minor Essential Revisions

All of the references should be checked, not least to confirm they back up the statements being made e.g. Ref 17 18 are papers of mine. While important, neither supports the point being made and 18 is incorrectly cited. Refs 3 and 10 are the same! Perhaps Heaton et al BJCP 2009 would be a reference worth including.

Discretionary Revisions

The manuscript should be shortened. Much of the results section could be delivered in a table showing responses to specific questions.
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