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Dear Professor Eccles,

Here is our reply to the reviewers’ comments regarding our manuscript no. 2248488521561835 “Barriers to research utilization and research use among registered nurses in the care of older people: Does the BARRIERS Scale discriminate between research users and non-research users on perceptions of barriers? ” by Anne-Marie Boström, Kerstin Nilsson Kajermo, Gun Nordström and Lars Wallin.

We have read the two referees’ comments. Regarding reviewer 3’s comments we have made following changes in our manuscript:

1. We have added a column with t-values for the t-tests in Table 3. We have not made this addition for the t-tests in Table 2 because then Table 2 has to be in landscape format. If you like to have the t-values (and r-values) for the statistical tests in Table 2 we will expand the table with this information.

2. We have extended the sentence regarding the use of the Research Utilization Questionnaire in other studies ([Data Collection, The Research Utilization Questionnaire, page 6]) with a reference to our paper Boström AM, Nilsson Kajermo K, Nordström G and Wallin L: Registered nurses use of research findings in the care of older people which has been accepted in Journal of Clinical Nursing. In the background of that paper there is a compilation of nine published articles using the RUQ. Furthermore, in the section Methodological consideration (page 9) in the current manuscript the validity of the RUQ is commented.

3. We are grateful for the additional comments concerning language use and we have made the suggested changes.

Regarding reviewer 1’s comments we have conducted discriminant analysis concerning the two groups’ ratings on the four subscales. These new analyses revealed the same findings as the t-tests: there were significant differences between the two groups on the Nurse, Research and Presentation subscales. We believe that it is appropriate to use Students t-test for detecting differences between the two groups’ scoring on the subscales. It is not so common to use discriminant analysis and it might confuse the interpretation for some readers. Discriminant analysis also refers more to identification of predictors, which is not our purpose of the study. We also interpret your comment that you are not insisting that we should change this statistical analysis.
Furthermore, reviewer 3 comments that the abstract has not been revised. The revised manuscript that was resubmitted in January 2008 also had a revised abstract that was pasted into the box for abstract. Among other things the purpose was changed in the abstract from “Therefore, the main purpose of this study was to examine if perceptions of barriers to research utilization measured with the BARRIERS Scale and reported research use were associated” (version August 2007) to “Therefore, the purpose of this study was twofold: to describe RNs’ perceptions of barriers to and facilitators of research utilization and to examine the validity of the BARRIERS Scale in relation to research use” (version January 2008). Reviewer 1 stated that the purpose is now much clearer. This makes us uncertain if reviewer 3 did read the new abstract.

We hope our revisions are satisfying and that our paper will be accepted for publication in Implementation Science.
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Anne-Marie Boström,
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