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MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS

Overall the manuscript is well written and there is clear justification for the study. The methods and analyses are appropriate to the research question. However, there are a few minor issues that need to be addressed prior to its publication.

• Methods section – study design: While methods for data collection and analysis were reported, the authors did not describe the specific qualitative design used in the study. It seems like a qualitative descriptive was employed and this should be explicitly reported in the manuscript, including a brief description of this research design.

• Methods section – sample and recruitment: 4th paragraph, last sentence is unclear. Regarding professional educators – who are they, and are they also employed by the health districts/specialty health networks? Are they allied health practitioners trained to provide education/training to health professionals?

• Methods section – data collection: 6th paragraph, 1st sentence, delete the word ‘Being.’

• Results: 1st paragraph – Out of the 129 who expressed interest to participate, only 46 were included in the study. Was contact made to those who were not included, and what were they told?

• Figure 2: While it is not a major issue, it would be so much easier for readers if enablers/barriers are organised in a way that they could clearly see which ones correspond to capability, motivation and opportunity. Also, it would be good to report the enablers/barriers in the order in which they are presented in the text. For example, in the text, under ‘Opportunities to engage in workplace learning’, protected learning time is the first in the list, whereas in Figure 2, access to peers is reported as first.

• In the discussion, it was stated that four key messages were identified from the study. It is not clear why those four enablers/barriers were identified to be the most important factors. In the results section, where themes for each component of the COM-B framework are reported, there is no indication that some factors (i.e. themes) are more important (or more consistently reported by participants) than others.

• While the study findings have clear implications for practice, are there any implications for further research?
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