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Reviewer’s report:

1. Major Compulsory Revisions

A. General comments: The questions included in the survey were not specific and detailed enough to achieve the objective of the study. I do not think the results of the study would contribute to “development of educational interventions” even though the authors intended to contribute to it through the study.

B. Abstracts – backgrounds (Page 2): The authors need to clarify the objective of this study more clearly.
   i. The following questions included in the survey did not correspond to the scope of the study described in the background section:
      # “Control of hypertension is a significant public health problem.”
      # “I do a good job of treating my patients’ hypertension.”
   ii. The expressions used to describe the objective of the study such as “barriers to treatment” and “treatment decision making in the management of hypertension” need to be specified.

C. Methods (page 4): The authors need to explain about the parent population and the sampling method of the study in detail. The following description regarding the parent population of the study was not clear enough to understand the external validity of the study: “physicians attending a monthly clinical meeting (n= 28).”

D. Discussion/conclusion (page 7): the first sentence of page 7 (started with “much has been …”) did not have much relevance to the results of the study because educational interventions for changing physician behavior are beyond the scope of this study. I think the sentence need to be removed from the discussion.

2. Minor Essential Revisions

3. Discretionary Revisions

A. Backgrounds (Page 3): The objective of the study was not clearly stated in the background section. The first sentence of the method section (page 4) which described the objective of the study needs to be moved to the end of background
section.

B. Discussion/conclusion (page 6): the authors need to describe conclusion in a separate section.

C. Discussion/conclusion (page 6~7): The authors need to discuss what would be the effect of characteristics of the survey respondents such as the type of specialty and the location of practice on the result of the study.
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