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Reviewer's report and author’s response

Comment 1: In the methods section the authors mention that the interviews were based on a systematic review of the literature. Did they conduct a formal systematic review or are they referring to a traditional review of the literature used to inform the design of the interview guides. There is a big difference between the 2. Suggest they remove the word "systematic".

Response to comment 1: Thank you for this comment. We rather performed a review of the literature as a basis for the interview guides. We revised the term throughout the whole manuscript.

Comment 2: Also in methods: when authors use the work "contextualize the barriers" do they mean to organize the barriers?

Response to comment 2: We meant to organize the barriers in order to develop a context. We revised the term throughout the whole manuscript to make the purpose clearer.

Comment 3: There is mention of barriers to EBP and KT. The research was on barriers to EBP not to KT. KT is about the processes involved in implementing EBP. So KT subsumes EBP. Suggest delete KT.

Response to comment 3: We can't find the term KT in the manuscript.

Comment 4: Limitations section: when authors mention larger sample in a subsequent study, do they mean a more representative sample? one that would include various other stakeholders?

Response to comment 4: Sine our aim was to identify the barriers from the perspective of PCs and PRs, we didn’t mean to include other stakeholders. We rather meant that it would be worthwhile to run a study that includes a larger number of PCs and PRs to verify or expand our findings. We hope this answer makes it more clear.

Comment 5: In minor changes: #3 was not addressed/revised in the revised version.

1. There are several grammar and punctuation errors in lines 190-194. Line 194 “some of which may result in contradictory information” contrary to what?

Response to comment 5: We revised these errors and the inconsistency and propose the following:

“This view is based on the opinion that EBP is strongly affected by emerging research findings and new guidelines leading to frequent practice changes, which sometimes contradict prior guidelines and procedures and cause uncertainty.”
Comment 6: Formatting: please go through the paper carefully there are numerous typos and punctuation errors. (e.g. analysis section has several of these)

Response to comment 6: We went through the manuscript and the analysis section and worked on the typos and punctuation errors.