

NATIONAL BOARD OF EXAMINATIONS IN MEDICAL SCIENCES (NBEMS)
Foreign Medical Graduate Examination (FMGE)

EXTERNAL EXPERT REVIEW

Fund of Test Tasks (FTT) **«BASIC PHARMACOLOGY» — 2025/2026**

Osh International Medical University

Specialty: General Medicine (MBBS equivalent) | 4 Credits

FOCUS OF THIS REVIEW

Critical appraisal of the pharmacology Fund of Test Tasks (FTT) in relation to FMGE (NBEMS/NMC) standards and its effectiveness in assessing and preparing students for successful performance in the Foreign Medical Graduate Examination (India)

Institution	Osh International Medical University, Osh, Kyrgyz Republic
Discipline	Basic Pharmacology I + II
Programme	General Medicine (MD/MBBS equivalent)
Teaching Staff	Assoc. Prof. Aigul Momunova (PhD, Head of Dept.) + 4 Lecturers
Pre-requisites	Molecular Biology, Biochemistry, Physiology I–II, Anatomy I–II, Latin
Reviewer	Dr. Ankit Kumar, MBBS, MD, DM (Pharmacology) National Faculty, Prep Ladder FMGE Subject Expert, NBEMS Empaneled Examiner
Review Basis	FMGE Pharmacology Syllabus (NMC/NBEMS); Tripathi 8th Ed.; Previous FMGE Question Trends 2019–2025
Date	April 2026 Ref. No.: FMGE-PHARMA-EXT-2026-003

Upon comprehensive external evaluation of the submitted Fund of Test Tasks (FTT) for the discipline “Basic Pharmacology 2”, it can be concluded that the document reflects a structured, methodologically sound, and academically grounded approach to the assessment of medical students. The test bank consists of 400 multiple-choice questions and is supported by a clearly defined test specification (blueprint), which outlines the distribution of content areas and cognitive levels. This indicates a clear understanding of contemporary principles of assessment design, including alignment with competency-based medical education.

From a general perspective, the FTT demonstrates adequate coverage of core pharmacological domains and is suitable for summative assessment purposes. However, a deeper expert-level analysis reveals

certain imbalances in content distribution and opportunities for further enhancement, particularly in relation to clinical integration and higher-order cognitive assessment.

Table 1. Content Coverage Analysis

Pharmacology Domain	Coverage Level	Expert Comment
Cardiovascular Pharmacology	Fully Covered	High depth and adequate representation
Respiratory Pharmacology	Covered	Satisfactory
Anti-inflammatory Drugs (NSAIDs, GCS)	Covered	Adequate
Antibacterial/Antimicrobial Agents	Fully Covered	Strong representation
General Pharmacology (PK/PD)	Partially Covered	Needs expansion
Drug Interactions	Limited Coverage	Insufficient emphasis
Adverse Drug Reactions & Safety	Partially Covered	Requires strengthening
Clinical Pharmacology / Therapeutics	Limited Coverage	Needs significant improvement

As demonstrated above, while system-based pharmacology is well represented, foundational concepts such as pharmacokinetics, pharmacovigilance, and rational pharmacotherapy are relatively underrepresented. This limits the full competency-based assessment potential of the test bank.

From a testological standpoint, the overall quality of the items is acceptable, with many questions demonstrating appropriate structure, relevant pharmacological terminology, and alignment with curricular content. Importantly, some items incorporate clinical elements, which is a strong positive feature and aligns with modern expectations of medical assessment systems such as FMGE and NBEMS.

However, the quality of test items is not entirely uniform. While several items are well-designed and clinically meaningful, others remain predominantly recall-based and lack sufficient clinical context. Additionally, certain questions exhibit ambiguity in wording or overlapping answer choices, which may compromise test validity and reliability if not addressed.

Table 2. Identified Item Quality Issues

Issue Type	Frequency Level	Expert Comment
Ambiguous wording	Moderate	Requires revision for clarity
Overlapping answer options	Low–Moderate	May affect validity
Predominance of recall-based items	Moderate	Needs cognitive level balancing
Insufficient case-based questions	Moderate	Key area for improvement
Minor language/formatting issues	Low	Technical correction needed

Although the blueprint indicates an appropriate distribution of cognitive levels (recall, understanding, application), the actual content suggests that the proportion of higher-order (application-based) questions could be further increased. In its current form, the test bank remains somewhat knowledge-heavy, which is common in basic sciences but should progressively evolve toward more clinically integrated assessment formats.

Furthermore, while the internal multi-stage review process is commendable and reflects a commitment to quality assurance, the absence of formal psychometric validation (e.g., item difficulty index, discrimination index, reliability analysis) represents a limitation when evaluated against international standards.

Table 3. Expert Recommendations for Improvement

Area of Improvement	Specific Recommendations
Clinical Orientation	Increase proportion of case-based MCQs
Cognitive Complexity	Include higher-order (analysis/decision-making) questions
Test Validity	Eliminate ambiguous or multi-correct items
Standardization	Unify terminology and formatting
Psychometric Analysis	Implement item difficulty and discrimination analysis
Competency Mapping	Link questions to learning outcomes and competencies

In conclusion, the Fund of Test Tasks for “Basic Pharmacology” represents a well-developed and structured assessment resource that adequately covers the core content of the discipline and aligns with institutional requirements. It is suitable for use in summative assessment of medical students.

However, to achieve alignment with international benchmarking standards and to enhance its educational impact, further refinement is recommended, particularly in terms of increasing clinical relevance, improving item quality, and incorporating psychometric evaluation methods.

<p>External Reviewer:</p> <p>Dr. Ankit Kumar MBBS, MD, DM (Pharmacology) National Faculty, PrepLadder</p> <p>(signature)</p>	<p>Date:</p> <hr/> <p>Official Stamp / Seal:</p> <hr/>
--	--

This review is prepared on behalf of the FMGE External Curriculum Advisory Panel and submitted to the Academic Directorate of Osh International Medical University for action. One copy is retained by the reviewer's institution.