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1. Background - I suggest that the authors include the full Sackett 1996 definition of EBP in the opening paragraph of the background section as follows; 'the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of current best evidence in making decisions about the care of the individual patient. It means integrating individual clinical expertise with the best available external clinical evidence from systematic research'

2. Background - Is it possible for the authors to include some details about the content of the module, hours and credits (ECTS)?

3. Background - On page 3 line 53/54 in the section titled 'Developing a new UG EBP module' the authors refer to student response systems - what is this, perhaps clarify / explain.

4. Methods - Review the wording of the aim as set our on page 4 Methods, it specifies 'foster a culture of EBP…' this is going beyond the scope of the content of the present paper as it is presented, perhaps use the wording of the aim as set out in the abstract which I feel is clearer and reflects the content of the manuscript. This study sought to formally evaluate the impact of the EBP module using two validated questionnaires…'
5. Methods Page 5 - Tools / Instruments used, line 40, it would be helpful to add more details here regarding the two questionnaires, and a little bit about the number of questions and areas explored in the two scales.

6. General - Ensure consistency when referring to the module Evidence Based Nursing 1, EBN1, perhaps check the manuscript for any inconsistencies.

7. Results - At the start of the results section, line 26/27 on page 6 the authors should specify the response rate for the study at time 1 and 2.

8. Discussion - on page 7, line 53, the authors describe how the nursing students were able to use evidence and EBP guidelines to change their practice… did they complete clinical placements at this stage of the nursing course. If so perhaps this could be incorporated into the discussion. It would be an interesting discussion point.

9. Limitations - the low response rates should be mentioned here.

10. Discussion / Conclusion are there plans to develop complementary EBP e.g. EBPN 2 or 3 modules in the subsequent years of the nursing programme?

11. Table 5, define PICO.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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