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Reviewer's report:

General comments:

This is a "solid" piece of qualitative research. The question posed by the authors was well defined, the methods and data were sound and the authors were able to draw a number of practical suggestions from their findings.

The findings are likely to be useful those who work in the same area--i.e. they are very specific. If the authors want their research to have broader reach, they might want to consider situating their findings in the broader literature on barriers to uptake of evidence and to clinical governance more generally (there is a very large qualitative literature on this, to which the authors do not refer).

More detailed comments:

1) The section of the results entitled "motivation, intention and goals" was relatively weak and the findings reported here overlapped with other sections, especially the section on resource limitations.

2) In the section of the discussion entitled "different barriers across interventions and professions" (p29), the text did not seem to follow from the heading.

3) I was not convinced by the claim that "reported barriers and enablers were different across rehabilitation interventions and professions". The details may have differed, but it was more striking that all of the 6 categories seemed to apply to all professional groups.

Discretionary Revisions

All of the concerns I have raised above would point to "discretionary revisions"
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