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Reviewer's report:

The authors present an evaluation of an Knowledge Dissemination strategy implemented in a maternity ward of an Irish urban hospital. The dissemination strategy was in the form of an Evidence Rounds delivered as sessions during lunch hour to staff. This manuscript present a barrier and enablers assessment of 1-attending and presenting at the session; 2-investigation of the views of participants about the rounds in general and 3-identification of strategies for sustainability of the rounds. The authors present a well thought out project and the results provide a thorough examination of the perceived barriers and enables. There are a few minor revision that I believe will improve on the manuscript for publication.

1) The introduction is somewhat confusing. It feels like paragraph 3 (beginning on line 14) was inserted after a number of edits and I'm confused about the logic of the introduction. I recommend that authors review this section so the background, rationale, and evidence to support the objectives is clearer.

2) On line 8 and 9 of the introduction, I would argue that audit and feedback and the use of behaviour theories are tools used in or components of the investigation KT or implementation science. One is a specific type of intervention strategy and theory can be used to better design Implementation strategies that target behaviour change. I'm wary of having these two examples in the same sentence as the other examples given by the author.

3) On Line 47 there appear to be a word of two missing from the sentence "They recommended the use of strategies to increase attendance although the did not make specify what these might be [11]."

4) In the methods section the authors change from third person to pronouns. It would be better to stick to one for consistency.

One final comment, I would be interested to get the authors' thoughts on their rationale for not using theory in their investigation of barriers assessment. It may have helped in identifying those areas that may need to be overcome for attendance and sustainability that have to potential to be generalizable to other knowledge dissemination strategies other researcher may implement. Addressing this is in the discussion or limitations would be of benefit.
I believe that this study is a valuable contribution to knowledge dissemination activities with HCPs - Once these few minor recommendations are addressed I think this manuscript would be a great addition to the field.
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