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Again we would like to thank the reviewers for their valuable comments of the above referenced manuscript. We agree with the issues they have addressed, and we believe that this latest revision have further strengthened the paper. Our responses to each comment (in bold) are below the comments.

Reviewer 1:
For the most part, the authors have addressed the comments and suggestions of the two reviewers, and have justified their use of methods.

1. There are some typos and minor grammatical errors
   We have taken this advice into consideration.

2. The authors need to make explicit in the discussion section that these are the views of the nurses and that, while the study focused on the nurses’ experiences, these comments may be interpreted as being somewhat biased because of the lack of medical representation. This needs to be acknowledged in the limitations.
   We understand that this needs clarification, however, in the “discussion” chapter, under strengths and limitations of the study” heading such a clarification has been made in the following sentences:
   Sentence 4:
   • “Although all interviews were uni-disciplinary, reflecting exclusively the views of the nurse professionals involved, the combination of homogenous- and mixed groups, complemented each other”.

   Sentence 9-10:
   • The interviewer’s interest in the checklist and implementation process was clear to the participants, and the interviewer also had pre-existing work relationship with some of the participants. This might have influenced the nurses’ responses which additionally might have been interpreted as being somewhat biased because of the lack of medical representation.

Reviewer 2:
The authors have revised the manuscript thoroughly and I find the manuscript generally suitable for publication.
However, the article is only relevant to a very limited audience and I would encourage the authors to reflect on the generalizability of their findings to other healthcare settings and other implementation efforts in the discussion.

We agree that the generalizability or more precisely the transferability of the findings to other healthcare settings and other implementation efforts needs to be reflected in the manuscript. We have added a section (last 10 sentences) under the heading of “strengths and limitations” where we address these issues:

“This is yet to be seen, thus more research on the subject is needed. However, empirical data has shown that lack of awareness and motivation, as well as perceived external factors, is particularly important barriers to adopting and utilizing evidence based guidelines (31). In addition, Mickan et al. have shown in a systematic review that leakage from guideline publication to utilization occurs among different specialities, across a range of recommendations, in different countries and healthcare systems (32). The production and dissemination of evidence based clinical guidelines is not sufficient to ensure that research evidence gets into practice, as with the WHO’s Safe Surgery Checklist. As for the nurses involved in our study utilizing the checklist as intended seemed to be part of an existential challenge; obtaining social or professional acceptance within their team”.

On the basis of this the following references have been added to the manuscript: #31-32.