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Reviewer's report:

General
I was interested to learn about the barriers about the evidence based nursing in Norway. However, I have some comments to some issues.

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. The background needs to be revised for the related literature. What is already known about the problem and what this article adds could be clarified. There are more evidence that would be included as a literature review. That can be helpful to understand the known to unknown aspects of the topic; like, knowledge resources, EBN skills, etc. Some of them presented in the discussion section. Presenting some results from other studies as a literature review may help to understand of the extent of the problem and support the discussion.

2. More details about the instrument (DEBP) are required, such as, psychometric properties of the original tool and the current study, the number and content of items in each section.

3. The rational of choosing independent and dependent variables is not clear. In the Table 3, there are three independent variables (age, years of nursing practice and years since last degree). Especially, first an second variables probably measure same feature. In the same way, in the Table 5, page 9, “nursing and medical journals as source of evidence” were analysed as dependent variables for evaluating evidence based practice skills. Additionally there are some correlational analysis between EBP skills and barriers (page 9, last paragraph). They are also measuring same features (skills), and naturally have high correlations. This points and rationals need to explain and consider for using a theoretical framework and selecting the variables for analysis. There is no any connection or explanation “why adjusted for age?”.

According to these results, it is difficult to say “EBP skills will decrease barriers and increase the evidence use”. If thought to be it needs to be clarified.

4. The paper had some citing from the other studies to support the study results but it is not clear what is the different contribution of this study. What does it mean all of this analysis for practice? It can be clarified the contribution of this research to the literature.

Some of the evidence based nursing practice models could be used for...
discussion section.

5. Answers the following questions should be written: How will the authors use the results to improve EBP in their context? What are the suggestions for future studies?

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Some suggestions for abstract are: The measurement tool could be written under the methods section instead of the aim. The aim of the study written in abstract as “to identify the barriers”, but the study also examine the resources of knowledge and skills for evidence-based practice”. Sample size is 407, not 661. The response rate needs to be added methods section (both abstract and methods in the main text).

2. It looks that the some collected data were not reported. Such as, open-ended questions about the barriers and facilitaros of the evidence based nursing practice. Report needs to include that data or the explanation that they are beyond the content of this paper; otherwise they could be removed from the manuscript.

3. Page 8- check the ranking of the barrier items. (between 3-5)

4. Results: The presentation of the results requires editing to facilitate reading and clarity. For example, the statements (as written not shown in table)

5. The table 3 is difficult to understand. Table 3 and related text need revision for clarity and ease of reading.

6. The title of the table 4 should be written in English.

7. Figure 1 shows how nurses perceive their EBN skills. Not “use” as stated related paragraph on page 9.

8. Conclusion repeates the results of the study. Editing also could be helpful to stress the implication of the study.

Discretionary Revisions

Bolding the subheadings can be facilitate to follow the text.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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