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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. General: is there any possibility to add some more results/ data from this survey? For a full-text article I would expect some more ‘meat on the bone’.
2. Methods, setting: how was the questionnaire distributed? How did the participant fill out the questionnaire? Was this face-to-face? This is not clear from the methods.
3. Methods, setting: What was the return rate of the questionnaire? Or in other words, how many staff members have been asked to achieve the final sample size?
4. Discussion: what is the possible impact of this work on the policy maker-level?

Minor Essential Revisions
5. Methods, setting: I would suggest to add a table with the full questionnaire distributed
6. Methods, setting: Probably not everybody is aware what the abbreviation PHAC/CIHR means. I would write this out.
7. Table 2: I would like to see the 95% confidence intervals
8. Table 2: The sample size for the electronic method (nurses) is possibly not very meaningful.
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