

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Evidence-based practice utilization and its associated factors among nurses working at public hospitals in West Shoa zone, central Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study
AUTHORS	Megersa, Yohanis; Dechasa, Abebe; Shibr, Abera; Mideksa, Lema; Tura, Meseret

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Zellefrow, Cindy The Ohio State University Helene Fuld Health Trust National Institute for Evidence-based Practice in Nursing and Healthcare
REVIEW RETURNED	27-Jun-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thank you for bringing this important work forward! Your work adds to the body of evidence around EBP utilization and its associated factors to help establish the "state-of-the-state" of EBP in African nations.</p> <p>I did find opportunities for strengthening your manuscript. Please see the attached document with commentary. Some revolve around clarity and flow of thoughts; some around grammar and others around sentence structure. I have created a PDF that has collected the commentary for each page and created a new page immediately after the original one where commentary or suggestions have been made so you have them close at hand. The one thing I found to be missing was any mention of study limitations. Please revisit and add that as well as addressing the commentary provided.</p> <p>Keep up the great work around bringing EBP to African healthcare! Wishing you the best as you continue this important work.</p>
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Vehviläinen-Julkunen, Katri University of Eastern Finland, Department of Nursing Science
REVIEW RETURNED	04-Jul-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thank you for your highly important manuscript. There are some issues I would like you to revise and consider.</p> <p>Introduction: There is a lot of international descriptive papers and some reviews on the state of EBP especially touching nursing. The introduction would be stronger if some rapid review could have been conducted. As similar issues are confronted around the world.</p> <p>Actual data collection description is missing. This was a survey but please clarify where nurses filled in the questionnaires? Special</p>
-------------------------	---

	<p>space ? meeting etc../during their working hours or at home? this protocol is unclear. Provide concrete description.</p> <p>Discussion: Study strengths and limitations are missing and you should consider if the way data were collected would influence reliability and validity.</p> <p>Discussion is reflecting mainly research from authors' own country. However, similar findings can be located around the world.</p> <p>Table 2 is missing n=</p> <p>There are some language issues still to review.</p> <p>Table 2/please add n= to the heading</p>
--	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1			
1	English language, grammar, and flow of idea needs improvement	Accepted	Edited throughout the whole document
1	Report of conclusion in the abstract needs rework	Accepted	Edited - Page 3
2	Limitation needs to be clear	Accepted	Edited - Page 4
3	Introduction part about definition of EBP	Accepted	Edited - Page 4
4	Citation needed for model of EBP of five steps	Accepted	Edited - Page 4
5	Rework statement of the problem	Accepted	Edited - Page 5
6	Remove comma	Accepted	Edited - Page 5
7	What is “It” refers to?	Accepted	Edited - Page 5
8	Remove the detail information of the demographic of West Shoa Zone	Accepted	Edited - Page 6
9	Sample size of the previous study not clear, needs more explanation	Accepted	Edited - Page 7
10	Add more explain about the questionnaire	Accepted	Edited - Page 8
11	Merged sections needs citation of the previous study or what brought you to merge the section	Accepted	Edited - Page 8
12	What was included during training data collectors	Accepted	Edited (each questionnaire variables were checked line by line for clarity(to prevent misunderstanding), ways of data distribution and how to respond if respondent face problem while

			filling the response. This all for sake of quality data collection and to make data collectors to have similar understanding on the questionnaires.
13	Include reliability and validity of the other part	Accepted	Edited - Page 9
14	Rework the sentences about knowledge in result	Accepted	Edited - Page 10
15	Is this a typo or is the p value really 0.501?? If truly 0.501, then does this really support that the model was adequately fit??	Yes it's a p-value(sig.)	This indicates the model was adequately fit - Page 10
16	What kind of degree did they have as an entry level (since you use the language "and above")?? Please clarify	Accepted	Edited As "bachelor" - Page 11
17	For better flow of thought and ease of reading, consider following the steps of EBP when you report out these findings (mirror the order you put them in table 2, so start with formulating clinical questions, then move on to searching for evidence, etc.).	Accepted	Edited - Page 13
18	you do consider patient preferences and values in your definition of EBP (even though not stated in the introduction). If you haven't already done so, please go back and expanding your definition of EBP in the introduction to include the integration of patient preferences and values. You might look to the Melnyk & FineoutOverholt references you've cited for a more contemporary definition that includes best evidence, clinical expertise and patient preferences and values	Accepted	Edited - Page 4
	help me understand...are you talking about nurses sharing the different types of evidence that were synthesized to bring them to a recommendation (i.e. the external evidence discovered in the literature, PLUS the evidence from their clinical expertise (i.e. physical assessments and/or quality improvement data, etc.), OR are you talking about nurses sharing outcomes (as indicated by the categories in Table 2)?	Accepted	Edited - Page 14
	Consider moving these statistics immediately after the barriers you're discussing (i.e. lack of autonomy to		We understand your suggestion but this is the descriptive

	change practice (35.73%), culture of my team not receptive to EBP implementation (35.23%)..." . This would help people connect the results with the factor more readily.		one. But for the sake of analysis we have merged this part to check the association with outcome variable. - Page 15
	"Enhancing" should not be capitalized since it's in the middle of a sentence.	Accepted	Edited - Page 17
	Should this be expanded to be "magnitude of evidence-based practice utilization"? That's the language you used in other places across this work		The word magnitude is better than prevalence and also previous study used the word "magnitude" - Page 20
	Consider adding a sentence that provides a broad overview of the associated factors as well.	Accepted	Edit - Page 20
	This is a typo--this reference is from 2005; not 2015.	Accepted	Edited - Page 26
	Reviewer 2		
1	The issue raised in introduction part about descriptive study	Accepted	Edited - Page 4
2	Description of actual data collection	Accepted	Edited - Page 8
3	Study strength and limitation missed, you should consider if the way data were collected would influence reliability and validity	Accepted	Edited - 4
4	Discussion is reflecting mainly research from author's own country		But we exclude old study and also with similar title and study population - Page 20-23
5	Please add "Table 2" n value (n=?)	Accepted	Edited (included) - Page 14

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Zellefrow, Cindy The Ohio State University Helene Fuld Health Trust National Institute for Evidence-based Practice in Nursing and Healthcare
REVIEW RETURNED	22-Aug-2022
GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank you for your diligence in addressing the initial comments from our reviews. You did a beautiful job of responding to each one. The resulting evolution is more powerful than your original work. Thank you! In the meantime, these changes did cause a handful of grammatical issues that now need to be addressed and a couple bits of content that could stand to be looked at one last

	time to optimize your messaging. Congratulations on a job well done!
--	--

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1			
1	English language, grammar, and flow of idea needs improvement	Accepted	Edited throughout the whole document
3	Definition of EBP	Accepted	Edited (“B” changed to “b”) - Page 3
4	Definition of EBP	Accepted	Edited and the word scientific was removed - Page 3
5	Introduction part about the definition of EBP	Accepted	Edited (expertise was replaced) - Page 3
6	Introduction part	Accepted	Edited and the word care was removed - Page 4
10	Add more explanation about the questionnaire with the author’s name	Accepted	Edited - Page 7
11	Make clear the “purpose” under the abstract		Edited and removed because the journal did not support the “purpose” in the abstract - Page 2
11	Revise the strength and limitations of the study	Accepted	Edited - Page 3

12	Discussion part	Accepted	Edited and the word "while" was removed Page – 20
	Reviewer 2		
1	<p>The discussion is reflecting mainly research from the author's own country and our previous response was not clear. "But we exclude old studies and also with similar titles and study population". At that time, we want to say "we exclude old research articles even though they are similar in title or study population from our research.</p> <p>- But now we have added some articles from another country.</p>	-Accept	<p>Edited(reworked) and references from 27- 29 in the discussion part were added.</p> <p>-Page 21 – 23</p>

VERSION 3 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Zellefrow, Cindy The Ohio State University Helene Fuld Health Trust National Institute for Evidence-based Practice in Nursing and Healthcare
REVIEW RETURNED	07-Nov-2022
GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thank you for your resubmission!! I so appreciate all the hard work you've put into this important piece! Your commitment to excellence shows. You have done a nice job of addressing the our feedback, providing clarifications and additional details to add richness to the manuscript. Thank you!! All that remains is to address some structure and grammar issues to make it more readable. Please see the attached document for additional feedback about the flow of thoughts, additional clarification needed to more effectively communicate your thoughts and some grammatical issues that need addressed. Keep up the wonderful work as we strive to improve healthcare for all through evidence-based practice!</p>

VERSION 3 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1			
1	English language, grammar, and flow of idea needs improvement	Accepted	Edited throughout the whole document
2	Introduction part -first paragraph (include the importance of the EBP model and edit the last sentences by ending "...best care"	Accepted	Edited - Page 3
	-Move the 2 nd paragraph to the last paragraph above the "objective" for the flow of the idea	Accepted	Edited -page 4
	- the 3 rd paragraph was reworked and for the flow of the idea, now it comes to the position of the 2 nd paragraph	Accepted	Edited - Page 3 & 4
3	Comment number (ZCG-6) was a repetition	-	
4	Method part, under data collection tools and techniques - Restructure the first couple of sentences	Accepted	Edited Page- 6
	- Also, merge the 2 nd and 3 rd paragraph	Accepted	Edited Page- 7
5	Discussion part - Include the new references (from Norway, U.S, and Saudi Arabia) in the introduction to connect with the discussion	Accepted	Included in the introduction Page – 21
6	Lists of abbreviations - Remove the unused abbreviation	Accept	Removed Page – 24

VERSION 4 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Zellefrow, Cindy The Ohio State University Helene Fuld Health Trust National Institute for Evidence-based Practice in Nursing and Healthcare
REVIEW RETURNED	30-Dec-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thank you for addressing the comments and suggestions made in the first round review. Your hard work continues to show!! Your enhancements of the introduction have improved the manuscript. That being said, I still see a few issues that need to be addressed in the introduction. First, you provided three definitions of EBP; the first one (from the Melnyk et al 2004 article) is the most widely accepted definition of EBP, not just in nursing, but in all disciplines that accept the notion of EBP vs. Evidence-Based Medicine (EBM); as you state in the first sentence, EBP is bringing together the best evidence (external evidence (so literature of all kinds; not just research studies), with clinical expertise and patient preferences and values to make decisions. Consider eliminating the second definition (sentence #2) as well as the third sentence (in fact, I'm afraid I'm not finding that definition or idea anywhere within the reference cited and it is contradictory to Dr. Melnyk's teachings as we use other types of literature, including systematic and literature reviews, qualitative studies, clinical practice guidelines, published quality improvement and other EBP projects as well as manufacturer guidelines (if devices are part of the clinical issue) and even expert opinion; none of which have statistical analysis connected to them).</p> <p>With the addition of the new content and movement of previously existing content, there is still an issue with flow of ideas. Please see the attached document with comments</p>
-------------------------	--

VERSION 4 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

	Reviewer 1		
1	<p>Introduction part</p> <p>-the 1st paragraph about the definition of EBP</p> <p>- Again, under the 1st paragraph EBP model</p> <p>- In the 4th paragraph under introduction part</p> <p>-In the 5th paragraph under introduction</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>Accepted</p> <p>Accepted</p> <p>Accepted</p>	<p>2nd and 3rd sentences were removed</p> <p>- Page 3</p> <p>- Line 4-6</p> <p>The word “sequential” was removed</p> <p>- Page 3</p> <p>- Line 7</p> <p>The word “a study” was changed to “study” and citation was provided at the end of the sentences</p> <p>- Page 4</p> <p>- Line 1 and 3</p> <p>Edited</p> <p>- Page 4</p> <p>- Line 2-4</p>

VERSION 5 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Zellefrow, Cindy The Ohio State University Helene Fuld Health Trust National Institute for Evidence-based Practice in Nursing and Healthcare
REVIEW RETURNED	10-Jan-2023
GENERAL COMMENTS	Your hard work has paid off!! Thank you for your persistence in addressing suggestions. You bring important work forward!! Keep dreaming and discovering and let the evidence guide your journey!!