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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this elegantly written manuscript describing facilitators of EBP for physiotherapists in Sweden. The study is well designed and the conclusions are supported by the data. My minor comments are below.

Discretionary Revisions

Abstract:
First line of methods does not seem to belong here
Conclusion of the abstract is not supported by the results. For instance, the first line of the conclusion states that organizational and extra-organizational factors are particularly important, however the results make no mention of the relative importance of the 3 system levels. The meaning of the remainder of the conclusion is opaque

Background:
First sentence – perceived by whom? I am not sure that this perception exists in all countries.
No need to abbreviate ‘research use’ – this does not assist the reader in any way.

Methods:
Were physiotherapists of differing seniority included in the same focus groups?
Were managers present in the focus groups? These factors have the potential to influence the responses.

Page 7 paragraph 2 – do you mean a lack of mutual understanding?
It appears that only one author developed the codes – this is a limitation which should be stated.

Results are nicely presented.
Page 11 – the meaning of the quote at the end of paragraph 2 (organisational culture) is not clear to me. Is there another quote which would more clearly illustrate this point?

Discussion :
This section is very long and could be shortened as described below.

Sentence 1 – the systems described are not really at the ‘societal’ level – the phrase ‘extra-organisational’, as used in the abstract, seems more apt.

Page 18 last paragraph, beginning ‘Interventions aimed at modifying clinical practice...’ – I am not sure of the purpose of this paragraph. Although it is beautifully written, it does not relate to the data presented in this manuscript. It relates to ‘habit’s and their effect on translation of evidence into practice, which is not the same thing as identifying facilitators. This entire paragraph could be removed.

Paragraph 1, page 25 could be removed.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests