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Reviewer 1: Alan Pearson

Reviewer's report:
1. This is an interesting paper and provides clear descriptions of the awareness, beliefs and attitudes of Taiwanese health professionals in relation to the implementation of evidence.
Reply: We highly appreciate your kind comment.

Major Compulsory Revision
2. The major weakness of the MS is the standard of written English. There are many grammatical errors that require correction to render it suitable for publication.
Reply: Thank you for this recommendation. In the revised manuscript, we had a native English-speaking editor review the grammar.

Reviewer 2: Naohito Yamaguchi

Reviewer's report:
The authors use the term "EBP implementation", but the definition of "EBP implementation" is not given clearly and explicitly. The authors should describe how the meaning of "EBP implementation" was given in the questionnaire or attached letter to the respondents. If the definition of "EBP implementation" was not given explicitly to the respondents, the authors should describe the possibility that questionnaire answers were influenced by this vagueness.
Reply: We thank you for your thoughtful recommendation. Our questionnaire did provide a clear and explicit definition of EBP implementation. In the revised text, we added details of what the questionnaire asked regarding implementation of EBP in "Materials and Methods" (page 6, lines 16-23).
Reviewer 3: Julie Hadley

Reviewer's report:
- Minor Essential Revisions

1. Title - I think that the title of paper should be altered to include the terms 'a questionnaire survey' as it could inadvertently mislead the reader into thinking that the paper is about how a programme of EBP has been implemented in a hospital setting.

   Reply: Thank you for the thoughtful recommendation. In the revised text, we added “a questionnaire survey” to the title to avoid any misunderstanding (page 1).

2. Materials and methods, subjects; how were the hospitals randomised?

   Reply: We used cluster sampling to randomize the hospitals. In the revised manuscript, we added more details on how the hospitals were randomized (page 5, lines 1-5 from the bottom).

3. Materials and methods, questionnaire; state the examples of the EBP characteristics in this section (i.e. the text for figure 1 legend) to aid understanding of the meaning of belief, attitude, knowledge and skill as these are very broad terms and can be interpreted in different ways.

   Reply: We thank you for your thoughtful recommendation. In the revised text, we added details of what our questionnaire asked regarding the beliefs, attitudes, knowledge, skills, and implementation of EBP in "Materials and Methods" (page 6, lines 9-23).

4. Figure 1: is this referring to the % of respondents?

   Reply: Yes. In the revised Figure 1, we added “of respondents” to make the figure easier to understand.

5. Figure 3: needs to be clearly defined as it is unclear what it is showing.

   Reply: Thank you for the recommendation. In the revised Figure 3, we clearly defined what Figure 3 shows.

6. Figure 2 and 3, horizontal axis - is this referring to the % of respondents?

   Reply: Yes. In the revised Figures 2 and 3, we added “of respondents” to make the figures easier to understand.
- Discretionary Revisions

1. Abstract - Background, 2nd sentence: state or expand meaning of 'main' health personnel
   
   Reply: Thank you for the comment. In the revised abstract, we rephrased the meaning of main and allied health personnel (page 2, lines 4-5).

2. Abstract - conclusion, 3rd sentence: states 'observed the factors associated with EBP implementation'. This is quite vague and needs to be made more explicit as to what the factors are.
   
   Reply: Thank you for the comment. In the revised abstract, we addressed what the factors are (page 3, lines 1-2).

3. Background - 2nd sentence: the term 'verifying' is incorrect in this context - 'searching' would be more appropriate
   
   Reply: In the revised text, we replaced 'verifying' with 'searching' as per your recommendation (page 4, line 4).

4. Background - 2nd paragraph, 4th sentence; the reference used to evidence the statement that evidence in implementation of EBP is still lacking is quite old (1999) - can the authors find a more current reference?
   
   Reply: Thank you for the comment. In the revised manuscript, we added a more-current reference (reference 24 on page 4, line 15 and page 18).

5. Results - awareness of EBP, 2nd paragraph, 1st sentence: state meaning of 'related terms'
   
   Reply: Thank you for the recommendation. In the revised text, we gave the meaning of “related terms” in "Materials and Methods" (page 6, lines 9-11).

6. Results - awareness of EBP, 2nd paragraph, last sentence: define meaning of 'technicians' as the term may mean different things in different countries.
   
   Reply: We defined the meaning of “technicians” in the revised text (page 8, lines 6-8 of "Results").

7. Results - barriers to and training in EBP, 2nd sentence: define meaning of 'convenient kits'
Reply: Thank you for the comment. In the revised text, we defined “convenient kits” (page 10, lines 5-6).

8. Results - barriers to and training in EBP, 2nd sentence: define meaning of 'clinical incorporation' - term in vague
   Reply: Thank you for the comment. In the revised text, we rephrased “clinical incorporation” as “incorporation with clinical practice” (page 10, line 11).

9. Results - barriers to and training in EBP. 3rd sentence: define meaning of environmental factors' - term is vague
   Reply: Thank you for the comment. In the revised text, we defined “environmental factors” (page 10, lines 4-5).