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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript and I thank the authors for the amendments already made.

Major compulsory revisions:

2nd last paragraph on page 10 – this seems to be an incomplete paragraph

Last paragraph in the results – I think this would sit better in the methods as it’s a discussion of the approach to post-hoc analysis. Presentation of these results are ok here.

I’d recommend not re-reporting results in the discussion. The numbers and percentages have already been reported - please interpret and synthesise in the discussion e.g. 1st paragraph – rather than restating all the percentages, broadly summarise what was found and then take it to the ‘so what’ discussion – why are these important/what does this mean? (which you have done, in part).

The first paragraph is also very long. Suggest reducing length. One idea per paragraph.

I still feel that a some changes are required before accepting for publication – with a stronger emphasis and exploration around the potential for discussion of ‘knowledge transfer’ methodologies to increase adherence to guidelines discussed in this paper. In the first full paragraph on p13 (“Previous work…”) and the “Future research…” paragraph suggest some directions, but these are non-specific to this particular workplace. They are good to ‘set the scene’, but I’d suggest drawing on ‘knowledge translation’ or ‘implementation science’ methodology to discuss tailoring potential interventions to these barriers/evidence-practice gaps identified and what may be done in the future (specifically) to overcome these gaps in practice.

Discretionary revisions:

I suggest keeping your decimal places in p-values to 1 decimal place, especially for the non-significant values. Greater ‘accuracy’ is not required in these instances.
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