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Reviewer’s report:

General

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

I find this paper interesting and well written but I have two concerns:

The rationale for this study is not that clear. The purpose is clear but the argument that lead to the purpose is unclear. If we know there is a gap (between what is known and what is done in practice) and we know that there are barriers -why do you then have to examine if perception of barriers is associated with reported use of research findings? Further down in the text (bottom of page 3) it appears that you also wanted to investigate the underlying assumption of the BARRIERS Scale. There is also a glimpse of this at page 4 in the lines before Methods. I get the flavour of a paper with more of a methodological character than what is described in the purpose. If you could express this more clear in the purpose I think it will add value to the paper.

My second concern is about the statistics, in your abstract you use the word association, also at page 4 "perceived barriers are associated with reported research use" and on page 7 you use the word correlation (correlation was found between the respondents scoring ...). as to my knowledge there is a slight difference between the words and I prefer to use associated in this context. Also, in Table 1 the Total n=140 and if I add Research users with Non research users I get 134. I miss data from 6 persons? and can not find any explanation for this in your manuscript.

My last comment is on the references, it could be wise to add the information (in Swedish) on references that are available only in Swedish.
**What next?:** Accept after discretionary revisions

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.