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Reviewer's report:

In this paper, authors report survey findings on use of EBM with a sample of Romanian physicians. As a survey, findings are limited by sample and representativeness, but the findings give some insight into EBM use in Romania and the authors consider these limitations.

Some more detailed comments, in case helpful to authors.

The background sets the study up, and could be improved slightly with the help of a native English speaker, to help the flow but the content is fine.

e.g. Page 3, Line 55 consider changing to Previous studies have examined use of EBM In clinical practice. Aguirre-Raya et al examined medical students, interns and specialists perceptions of EBM and reported etc.

Line 67 Little is known about the clinical use of EBM in Romania.

Methods: it might be helpful to readers to know a little about medicine in Romania - are all physicians specialists (e.g. does family medicine exist), as I was unclear in the results where some physicians had two specialties? Also is continuous professional development optional or mandatory? Do physicians get financial support to support continuous learning (as this would likely influence app usage)? These factors could be presented to help the reader understand the context or as part of the discussion to interpret the findings.

In terms of the survey, I wondered about how the question on levels of evidence was asked, it didn't seem to compare meta-analysis and systematic reviews with other types of study such as case-control, cohort etc. I think separating out meta-analysis, from systematic reviews felt a bit unfair. Also, as the authors note there can be times when a poorly conducted meta-analysis may not be as valuable as a well conducted RCT. So I am hesitant to over-rely on the interpretation as made by the authors.

Data analysis - I didn't understand the statement that respondents not active in their first specialty were considered as trainees, can u explain? Pg 5, L 108 - think it's a typo - first word should be Quantitative?

Results: Is there any national data to which the authors can compare to understand how representative this sample is? Table 1 - I'm not sure the region of graduated university is essential to this publication. Would the term 'medical' be more specific than 'clinical' specialties?

Discussion The authors situate their findings in the literature and identify limitations, in particular issues of sampling and survey response. They also try to contextualize their findings to reflect on implications. Perhaps the discussion could be shortened somewhat.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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