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Reviewer’s report:

Discretionary Revisions

1. The rationale for the study would benefit from further explanation. Why is there a need for a quantification of GPs attitudes to guidelines and the barriers to guideline adherence? What will quantitative findings add to what is already known from qualitative research?

2. The authors state that a validated questionnaire to identify barriers to guideline adherence already exists but that they used this in combination with data from their focus group study to develop a new questionnaire. Why did they feel a new questionnaire was needed? What did their focus groups data add to the existing questionnaire? And how was this validated? Why were the 4 guidelines used chosen? And why were the specific combinations of guidelines chosen.

3. The main caveat about the data is the low survey response rate. Is there anyway the authors can show that respondents were representative of their sample – the comparisons they make are with Dutch GPs overall but this was not their original sample.

4. In general the discussion is well supported by the data. However I am a little concerned that the choice of only 4 guidelines from a pool of 90 for interrogation in the study limits the confidence with which the results can be generalised. The authors recognise this point but their rationalisation that the guidelines included were diverse would be improved by further explanation of the criteria by which their diversity was assessed.
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