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Dear Simon Harold,

We proceed to answer your suggestions about paper MS: 6406832536175188 "Perception of evidence-based practice and the professional environment of Primary Health Care nurses in Spanish context: A cross-sectional study".

We have highlighted the changes in the manuscript in red. We also attach the responses and comments to the reviewers.

Thank you very much,

Miguel Bennasar

**Response to reviewers**

**Reviewer #1: Clarie Goodman**

The authors have addressed the reviewers’ comments and referenced relevant research on the uptake of evidence in primary care settings and discussed in more detail the implications of their findings.

*R: This has been added.*

Needs further language corrections before being published

*R: The entire manuscript has been reviewed.*

**Reviewer #2: Marilyn Kirshbaum**

Minor Essential Revision:
I see that some improvement have been made, but there is still a need for basic improvements in language and style. For example, in reporting numbers they should be written out if they appear at the start of a sentence (i.e. Five instead of 5); p3 'On the other hand' instead of 'In'; p7 at the start of the Discussion 'higher than that obtained (rather than: the obtained). These types of mistake appear throughout and are quite numerous.

*R: This has been changed.*

Discretionary Revisions:
1. The title and objectives convey the outcomes of the report, the data seem sound although they are reported very concisely – barely one page of writing, although the tables appear to be fine, and as they will be integrated, I have no suggestion to
make, but it would be better to write about more of the findings in addition to presenting tables.
R. Your suggestions have been considered.

2. The Discussion is satisfactory. The Conclusion section, particularly the first paragraph, should be strengthened by using more direct language – this conclusion is not new, many before you have come to the same vague conclusion that a change in culture is required. The angle here could be that this is reflected in the Balearic Islands too, in addition to the US, Canada, Britain etc. e.g. a call for global change, as it continues to be a problem for nurses in different parts of the worlds.
R: This has been changed.

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published. The question is posed as an aim, which is understandable, but could be improved if set out as several objectives, rather than a long sentence before the Methods section.
R: The entire manuscript has been reviewed.