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**Reviewer’s report:**

I applaud the wide-reaching impact that the work these authors are doing will have on promoting EBM education. However, some revisions are required.

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

1) I feel that this paper does not substantially add to the information presented in the authors' Nov. 2007 publication, "A clinically integrated curriculum in EBM for just-in-time learning through on-the-job training: the EU-EBM project." Although I realize that additional modules have been added since the 2007 report, the background, rationale, and processes are the same and therefore redundant in this paper. In fact, the details that I was seeking as I read the current submission, I found in the 2007 paper.

2) The authors speak of the course in the past tense. For example, in the Aims, objective and learning outcomes section, they say, "The course had a large e-learning component..." If the course has already been offered, this manuscript could be strengthened by adding some data. How many have participated? How many modules have been completed? Which modules appeal to the most physicians? What are the results of the self-assessment to date?

3) At times I was confused about which course the authors speaking -- the one described in the current study or the postgraduate course described in their April 2008 BMC paper.

4) The Discussion defines the CRISIS criteria, but the authors don't provide analysis of how these criteria were applied to their modules except in very broad generalities. The authors also state that since adult learning principles were used, this course "will contribute to their professional development and will improve their educational environment." Until some assessment is done, this statement probably can't be substantiated.

5) There are several word omissions, punctuation errors, and grammatical mistakes that can be easily corrected.
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