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Reviewer's report:

The authors reported on an important area of research - we definitely need scientifically constructed EBP surveys for use across health professional groups.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Please see my comments on your manuscript. I had difficulty determining the purpose of the instrument (was it for assessing progress in the EBP domains identified in a health professional academic program or was the tool developed for use in academic programs and practice? Or is the tool best for assessing change in EBP domains over time or pre-post education, or can it be used to determine differences in EBP domains across different groups? somewhere in the paper you need to be explicit on the purpose of the instrument and the groups it was designed for).

2. In the first paragraph, the authors make the position that undergraduate EBP education lags behind those of practicing professionals, and it is not certain what educational approaches may be most appropriate. This statement led me to believe the instrument they developed was to assess EBP educational approaches, yet, based on the items in the tested survey, the survey measures 5 domains of EBP and I guess the only way it can determine preferable educational approaches for EBP is to use the survey on students in different types of programs.

3. Although the authors stated the tool is for undergraduate EBP students, the tool was tested on students and practicing health professionals. If the tool is only for undergraduate students, then the testing should be limited to undergraduate health professional students. My recommendation is to use all of the participants in the analysis (students, academics, and practicing professionals) and broaden the description of the use of the tool.

4. In the statement about the aim of the study, expand the introductory content to include the purpose of the questionnaire. The title adds to my confusion - based on the manuscript title, the tool is to differentiate EBP domains across different disciplines. I didn't see much content, if any, in the manuscript about different EBP profiles across disciplines.

5. The title does not describe the content of the manuscript. The manuscript is about the development and testing of a questionnaire to assess domains of EBP.
Discretionary Revisions

1. Cite references used for initial item creation (see comment in manuscript).

2. On page 9, list the five factor names, and then describe each one.

3. Watch formatting on Figure 2 - the second line for the first item (work) was not visible.

4. Thought Table 1 should also have information from the Upton & Upton tool.
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