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General

It is important to study qualitatively the barriers and facilitators of the implementation of evidence-based medicine. The focus group method is most suitable for the study question. This study adds to the core of knowledge about factors involved.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

(1) Methods (page 4): The manuscript reports that the number of focus groups was 4. However, in Table 6 the code numbers for individual citations include numbers 5 and 6. This should be explained

(2) Conclusions (page 13)/Figure 1: The conceptual framework (figure 1) is less informative than would be expected on the basis e.g. the following statement in the conclusions: For a successful implementation of EBM different actors should be mobilized on different levels, integrating different factors to develop targeted interventions. In figure 1 there are no factors on the meso-level and only one factor on the macro-level.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

(3) Methods (page 4): The authors state that two independent researchers identified the important concepts by coding the first two transcripts separately. The manuscript does not state clearly who these researchers were. Consider mentioning these researchers more clearly at Authors contributions.

(4) Discussion (page 11): ..wherein barries can easily be situated Would located sound better than situated?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

(5) Listing of factors at the micro-level (page 8). Time, logistics and competences are listed. Would concepts like EBM resources or education describe these factors better?

(6) There is no mention about the need for rationing and prioritization, and the role of EBM in making these decisions. A comment would be appropriate e.g. based on 1:149.3
There was no mention on computerized decision support systems as a means of implementing evidence-based guidelines. The authors could consider e.g. including at least one of the following references:


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

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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