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Reviewer's report:

Assessing competency in Evidence Based Practice: strengths and limitations of current tools in practice.

This is a well balance and logical article that takes the problem of assessing EBP competence and discusses the two tools available and this then leads to implications for further work.

1. Does the debate present a novel argument, or a novel insight into existing work?
Yes: it is a good, up to date summary of where we are.

Major Revision
I would argue that the author has missed one important element of EBP which is the audit of clinical process and outcome. This is a major element and should be included in the revised version. There is an argument that clinical audit is in effect an assessment of the impact of evidence based practice. It does however miss the question, search, evaluation stages as well as how the evidence was implemented.

2. Does the debate address an important problem of interest to a broad biomedical audience?
Yes – I am biased but this is very important

3. Is the piece well argued and referenced?
Yes – but it needs more work –

Major Revision
I would like to see how the author found the information he/she did. Is he certain there are not other evaluation systems? I know a lot of universities have some sort of EBP assessment. There needs to be a search that is clearly described, and a review or discussion of those articles before going further into Fresno and Berlin. I would do a side by side comparison of the Berlin and Fresno to allow the reader to see these more clearly. There are also a number of on-line exercises – CFPC Pearls Program that invite EBP from clinicians. These are then assessed so how do these get included.
4. Has the author used logical arguments and sound reasoning?
Yes – very well reasoned

5. Is the piece written well enough for publication? (nb. Since we do not charge for access to published research, we cannot undertake the costs of editing poorly written manuscript. If you tell us that the writing is not acceptable for publication, we will ask the authors to find someone, or an editing service, to help them rewrite it. If you tell us that the manuscript is too poorly written for it to be peer reviewed, we will ask them to rewrite it now.)
Yes – author has good literacy skills.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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