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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

--Second paragraph, page 12, and first paragraph, page 13. Is it an error to refer to Table 2? Table 2 shows demographic information on participants. Do the authors mean Table 3?

--Table 3 on page 28. Several sets of Delphi intervention items share the same domain or overlap in terms of the domain covered. For instance, the following 2 sets of items are all related to one another and can be combined:

1. Contact time
   • Number of face to face teaching/learning sessions
   • Face to face contact time with learners
   • Student time NOT covered by face to face contact
   • Non-face to face contact time with learners

2. Post-training activities
   • Any post-intervention activities required
   • Supporting structures in organization to maintain behaviours targeted by intervention
   • What post-training support was provided
   • Whether follow-up sessions planned

Minor Essential Revisions

Method:

--First paragraph, page 6. Can you provide the number of studies included in the systematic review from which the corresponding authors were contacted for the Delphi survey?

Discretionary Revisions

Method:
--Third paragraph, page 7. Who was the four staff participating in the pilot testing of the first round survey? Were they experts in EBP? Did they ever teach EBP? Did they comment on the appropriateness of the example in Box 1 during the pilot testing of the survey?

--Can the editors of the journals in which the studies selected for the systematic review were published be considered as experts in EBP to provide information items for EBP educational interventions in the Delphi study? What was the rationale for selecting journal editors as part of the expert panel?

--Table 2, page 27. Only three medical doctors or 4 clinicians participated in the Delphi study. It is assumed that the majority of participants (22) had PhD or a doctorate degree, and that those participants may never be involved in practicing EBP. EBP is a health care practice or a different way to practice medicine. Could the composition of the expert panel affect the resulted information items from the four rounds of the Delphi study?

-- Box 1, Page 8. How was the example of an EBP education intervention in Box 1 be selected? It does not seem to be a well designed and described educational intervention. For example, it does not mention anything related to evaluation or learning assessment. I can't help but wonder if the study participants may have taken the cue from the example in providing information items during the first round of the Delphi study. Could the information provided in Box 1 may also have led participants to offer 37 items unrelated to educational interventions that mentioned in the last paragraph on page 11?

Results:

--The 19 intervention items for consideration within the reporting guideline presented in Table 3 do not include any items specifically related to learner needs assessment, the sequence of content addressed, or learning and learning outcomes assessment. Learning assessment is a very important component for an effective EBP or any educational intervention. One would question the value and utilization of such a consensus development report or guideline that does not include any items on evaluation/learning assessment.
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