Major Compulsory Revisions:
1. Methods section: Further clarification of the numbers of subjects in each measurement wave is needed. The numbers in Table 1 and the Figure 1 are confusing and do not appear consistent. The description of attrition across measurement times presented in the Methods section, paragraph #3 needs to be clarified.

2. The description of the instrumentation measuring research use needs strengthening (Methods section, paragraph #4). A table or figure should be used to present how each of the 3 items measuring instrumental, conceptual, and persuasive research was administered- including the definition and 3 examples of research relevant to each dimension of research utilization. Without this context, it is difficult to understand how the research use was measured.

3. The description of the psychometric properties of the items used in the study, including validity and reliability, needs more detail in the Methods section, paragraph #5 and other relevant places in the manuscript. (General Comment: Frequency of use of each type may not be the only important outcome. It seems probable that persuasive research use might be utilized less frequently than the other kinds, but when used appropriately to help change care or policy at a group or unit level, this is highly significant.)

4. The writing style in the manuscript is generally fairly easy to understand. But there are some occasional awkward phrases or wording that could be reworked/edited (such as “exercises” in Methods section, paragraph 34).

Minor Essential Revisions:
1. Background section, 1st paragraph: The authors argue that evidenced-based practice is especially critical for delivery of quality care when resources are limited. Perhaps even in higher resource contexts, evidenced-based practice is the optimal goal.

2. Background section, 1st paragraph: The authors refer to other studies that suggest that nurses’ use of research in clinical practice is “defective”. The outcome here needs to be described more fully without this kind of negative label.

3. Background section, 2nd paragraph: The authors refer to a national audit of higher education. The relationship of the findings from this audit to research
utilization needs to be clarified.

4. Background section 4th paragraph: The review of the literature in this paragraph is very truncated and more details about the studies, such as sample, methods and findings need to be included as they relate to the study being reported.

5. Background section 4th paragraph: The last sentence of this paragraph needs to be clarified.

6. Background section 5th paragraph: There are some generalizations in this paragraph related to the contexts in hospitals that seem fairly sweeping and without citation.

7. The logic of the narrative in the Discussion section, paragraphs #3-4 is difficult to follow.
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