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Reviewer's report:

I was very interested in your manuscript. It is an important research topic for guideline developers.
I very much like the way the subject was studied and I have only some minor suggestions to the authors that might improve the general framework of this study in general practice in The Netherlands.
1. The background is clearly written. Maybe the authors can add a small section about the Dutch health care system (is there free entrance, third party payment,...)
2. In the analysis part: I was just wondering why the researchers included the 'neutral attitude'? This might be an easy option for GPs who have no inspiration or time to think about the question thoroughly. Surely the researchers had a good reason for adding this. Maybe it is useful to mention data on these answers too. Or was it only used for calculation of the mean scores?
3. 'Characteristics of GP sample': I'd rather expect the last sentence in the discussion part.
4. I was wondering whether GPs also had the possibility to give any reflection/remarks in an open text area? I did not find this in the manuscript. This might help in discovering new barriers or suggestions.
5. I guess data on real adherence exist. Maybe future research can study the link between perceived performance for the guidelines mentioned in this manuscript, with the real performance (based on the use of indicators)
6. The discussion and conclusion are well written and give the reader a clear sight concerning the performed research and the 'take home messages', congratulations!

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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