**Manuscript evaluation guidelines**Title: WHAT THEY SAY AND WHAT THEY DO- VIEWS OF THOSE WHO ARE TAUGHT AND THOSE WHO TEACH UNDERGRADUATE MEDICAL/CLINICAL ETHICS IN TWO MEDICAL SCHOOLS IN KENYA  
  
1. Importance of the paper  
  
The manuscript is definitely relevant to developing countries and addresses an important issue of the teaching of medical ethics in Kenya.

2. Is it topical?  
  
The manuscript is relevant for publication in the IJME.

3. Originality  
  
The manuscript is original and contains information that would be relevant to medical educators. I see no evidence of plagiarism.

4. Conclusions

The conclusions are relevant – however, there is much redundancy in language throughout the manuscript and some repetitions, these need to be addressed.  
  
5. Other comments

My major concerns are related to the need for more information and the methods used.

1. There is a need to indicate what the KMDB curriculum actually states about the inclusion of medical ethics in the medical curriculum – is it merely a statement of desirability? Does it indicate the minimum number of hours that need to be allocated and when? Does it have clearly stated objectives. From the manuscript one understands that the actual content of the course that can be followed by each medical college is flexible?
2. For the purposes of a general readership not aware of the universities in Kenya it will be important to know some details of the universities that were studied – are they publicly funded? On what basis are medical students admitted? etc. Also what are the total number of medical colleges in Kenya? And how representative or applicable data collected from these two universities would be for Kenya as a whole.
3. In order to understand the qualitative data that was collected – it will be important for readers to understand some more details of the medical ethics course that was conducted in each of the two universities: how many hours were allocated to medical ethics throughout the course/ how were these lectures distributed across the years/ what specific topics were covered in each year / what was the methodology used – lectures alone / bedside clinics / case discussions / small group tutorials etc./ Were there key differences in the course content or methods used between the two universities on the basis of which the qualitative data need to be interpreted?
4. Since the lecturers did not have specific training in ethics – how were they allocated the task of teaching ethics – was it based solely on their interest or an administrative decision / did the disciplines hey represent allow them to adequately cover the course that was designed? For how long had the faculty been teaching the ethics course?
5. It would be important to understand the student composition of the two universities in terms of student enrolment / gender distribution/ ethnicities, if relevant to their outlooks.
6. On what basis were the numbers of FGDs decided? Was data saturation achieved? How was the data analysed - ?grounded theory/ What were the elements in the FGD guide and what prompts were probed?/ What were the elements of the key informant interviews?
7. It would be important for the author to also discuss the limitations of the study in terms of lacunae of data collected, generalizability of findings to Kenya as a whole, etc.

Minor comments:

1. Subsections within the Introduction can be deleted to provide a flow of thought
2. Language needs to be more succinct and repetitions avoided
3. The KMDB approved curriculum (ref and date ) – needs to be filled  
     
   6. Recommendation  
     
     
    Accept with modifications with review, provided the comments listed above are adequately addressed

7. Separate comments for the author

My major concerns are related to the need for more information and the methods used.

1. There is a need to indicate what the KMDB curriculum actually states about the inclusion of medical ethics in the medical curriculum – is it merely a statement of desirability? Does it indicate the minimum number of hours that need to be allocated and when? Does it have clearly stated objectives. From the manuscript one understands that the actual content of the course that can be followed by each medical college is flexible?

2. For the purposes of a general readership not aware of the universities in Kenya it will be important to know some details of the universities that were studied – are they publicly funded? On what basis are medical students admitted? etc. Also what are the total number of medical colleges in Kenya? And how representative or applicable data collected from these two universities would be for Kenya as a whole.

3. In order to understand the qualitative data that was collected – it will be important for readers to understand some more details of the medical ethics course that was conducted in each of the two universities: how many hours were allocated to medical ethics throughout the course/ how were these lectures distributed across the years/ what specific topics were covered in each year / what was the methodology used – lectures alone / bedside clinics / case discussions / small group tutorials etc./ Were there key differences in the course content or methods used between the two universities on the basis of which the qualitative data need to be interpreted?

4. Since the lecturers did not have specific training in ethics – how were they allocated the task of teaching ethics – was it based solely on their interest or an administrative decision / did the disciplines hey represent allow them to adequately cover the course that was designed? For how long had the faculty been teaching the ethics course?

5. It would be important to understand the student composition of the two universities in terms of student enrolment / gender distribution/ ethnicities, if relevant to their outlooks.

6. On what basis were the numbers of FGDs decided? Was data saturation achieved? How was the data analysed - ?grounded theory/ What were the elements in the FGD guide and what prompts were probed?/ What were the elements of the key informant interviews?

7. It would be important for the author to also discuss the limitations of the study in terms of lacunae of data collected, generalizability of findings to Kenya as a whole, etc.

Minor comments:

1. Subsections within the Introduction can be deleted to provide a flow of thought

2. Language needs to be more succinct and repetitions avoided

3. The KMDB approved curriculum (ref and date ) – needs to be filled
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