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Reviewer's report:

The following are the comments to the authors

Abstract:

In the results, you need to mention the total number of invited attendees and the number involved and the number before each percentage mentioned.
The conclusion in the abstract is not consistent with the conclusion in the manuscript and both need to be revisited.
In the conclusion, authors have suggested increasing junior doctors confidence in the CPG. How this can be done? And what advices you can give to make this recommendation practical?

Background:

Page 5, lines 15-17: You said that there is an expectation that junior doctors learn to deliver EBM. The statement needs to be explained and referenced.

Page 5, lines 27-34: This statement is contradicting the statement mentioned at the end of the previous paragraph, lines 15-17.

Page 6, lines 19-21: you said that TDF is focused on behavior and not attitude. The fact of using TDF for this research knowing that TDF is focused on behavior and not attitude need to be explained and justified more. What may control the use of junior doctors to CPGs can be well related to their attitude also.

Page 6, line 26: better to be "to investigate the extent of use or utilization"

Page 6, line 30: Better to become "which behavioral domain" rather than domain only to allow the reader who is not familiar with the TDF to identify the studied domains and the possible deficiency.

Methods:
Page 7, line 57-60: The already validated questionnaire was expanded. We need to know the basis on which this expansion was done and the source of the data utilized for the expansion.

Page 8, lines 6-8: You have mentioned that several alterations during the questionnaire development were undertaken, what has governed these alterations and briefly explain these alterations.

Page 8, line 12: You have used 5 points Likert scale. Explain why you have selected the 5 points scale and whether or not there was guidance for the participants on the meaning of each point.

Page 8, lines 24-28: Regarding frequency and intention of using CPG, why you have changed the likert scale points in these questions.

The persistence of low value Cronbach's alpha is a major problem in the used questionnaire unless it is well justified. The assumption that alpha score will be better with bigger sample is not a usual assumption when we validate a questionnaire.

Page 9, line 7: Full name and version of SPSS need to be mentioned before the abbreviation.

Discussion:

Page 16, lines 15-21: This statement is not clear and need to be explained

Page 16, lines 26-34: It will be better if the authors can tell us exactly what will this research add and make difference compared with the previously done research that utilized similar questionnaire. Is it only that it provides some insight on what is known earlier or there is a clear benefit of its performance? And why did they assume that different physicians category will end up with different results?. This is an important question to be answered to give this research importance. To me the discussion as given here is weak.

Page 16, lines 54-59: The two articles that you have referenced (8.16) both have shown the deficient knowledge of newly qualified physicians on EBM. You have found the same in 2012-2013. Therefore, this is not new information. What I wish to read in here is why there is deficiency and how this deficiency can be overcome.

Page 17, lines 6-36: The statements in this paragraph and the following one are vague and need further explanation.

They needs also to be linked to the research itself with clear discussion to understand what do the authors want to say. Finally, if the authors are aiming to discuss research weaknesses in these two paragraphs, they need to mention this clearly.

Page 17, lines 46-48: Social desirability bias need to be introduced and discussed before it is considered as one of the study limitations.

Page 17, line 53: The written conclusion doesn't mainly represent the research results. It needs to be re-written. Major part of the conclusion can be moved to the discussion.
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