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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this article. The authors have put a lot of effort in this validation, which provides an important information. However, I would suggest few changes to make the article more clearer.

P6r45 What was the the range of I-CVI values of the items?

Lots of typos through the text.

E.G.

P7R11 Typo: DAT Instead of data

P7R31 the sentence is cut in half

Results:

There are no descriptive parameters for overall scales, means and 95% confidence intervals. It would be more informative to have that information in one table, if possible. But that can be done only after you decide how to form the final score on the test.

P10R41 Through the text you are repeatedly referring to test-retest, which you did not examine. Your reliability is an example of interrater reliability, but not test-retest. If you would perform test-retest, you should have the same participants in two situations assessing the same items, and then to draw correlation between the assessments.

You have not provided the final description of your scale. What is the final form of the scale, what is the min-max of scores per subscale?

In your results you stated that most of participants did not have an education about guidelines in the past six months. Do you have the evidence that your participants knew what the guidelines are and what is their purpose? If the participants were assessing something which they are not familiar, that could raise the question about the validity of the study.
The cutoff values for the items in EFA was 0.45. However, some of the items had loadings above 0.45 on two factors. From what can be seen from the Table 3, each item could be in only one subscale, which can pose a problem if the item is related to two different factors. There is no information in the text what are the correlation between factors, which could be very useful information in composition of the final score, and it is nowhere mentioned in the text. Furthermore, in your model, could you elaborate why did you not perform the EFA on overall sample, which would be the initial step to test the validity? You reported the results on CFA on overall sample (N=768) but not on the EFA. Finally, were the factors in your models (CFA) related or orthogonal?

Discussion

P12R6 „The reasons for the low loading of these three items may be due to the fact that Chinese nurses are not very familiar with evidence-based medicine, but they are very passionate about learning and receiving new things.” Do you have the reference to support this?

Your sample characteristics are not strongly elaborated in the discussion. The sample in your study was mostly female, younger, with less work experience. You need to state this clearly in the discussion, because this could be the factor which would influence the results.

Once again, thank you for the opportunity to review this paper.
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