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Reviewer’s report:

General Overall an interesting survey that adds somewhat to the information we already have on the use of clinical practice guidelines. The paper needs further development before it will add to the current literature -- eg including subjective responses on impressions of the CPG and why or why not they are utilized would help others when attempting to implement a CPG. There are many typos which need correcting.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

The manuscript requires text editing and correction of punctuation, use of apostrophe, etc.

Background: paragraph 1, 'optimal management of UI INTERnationally...'

Materials & methods: paragraph 3 requires editing -- is repeated from paragraph 2

paragraph 4 & 5: delete or expand on the payment numbers 2138 and 97. These do not add anything concrete to the text.

Statistics: change 'was' to 'were'

Results: expand re: questionnaire -- disappointment, satisfaction. Give statements to support findings in questionnaire. None of the statistical tests are reported, presumably because the data was descriptive only. Last question asks for suggestions but these are not reported.

Prescriptions: seems to be Figure 1 not 2 that authors are referring to.

UI consultations: why was clinic closed? did physicians know it was going to close? perhaps this influenced their referrals. Add information about this in the discussion section. Figure 3 does not provide complete information re: years 2000 or 2002 to allow comparison.

Patient reimbursement: this section is unclear as it is not addressed in the literature review.

Discussion: limitation of the questionnaire was that it did not ask why GPs did or did not use the CPGs.

Questionnaire:

Paragraph 1: the findings from this study need to be put in a larger context. a 54% response rate is quite high; how does this compare to other countries. last sentence of paragraph missing were 'but were not available' -- this sentence sounds very judgemental -- reword.

Personal communication: ? appropriate for an academic paper.

Paragraph 2 In the discussion of the Dutch GPs, add more information -- how surveyed, how was lack of use assessed. Why would groups keep producing them if no one uses them?

Paragraph 3: sentence 3 contradicts above paragraph -- widely used?

meta-analysis re: cost -- the insertion of cost analysis does not fit here. The study did not assess cost effectiveness nor was it discussed in the lit review.

Fluid Intake

paragraph 1: sentence 3, ‘did NOT use’ or did use. it appears that the GPs did use this method.
Further research should survey the 795 GPs 1998-1999.
Prescriptions: paragraph 1, second to last sentence: insert 'the effectiveness of TCA' to read conducted in the effectiveness of TCA in patients with UUI'

UI Consultations:
the outpatient clinic requires more description and discussion on why it was closed.
Patient reimbursement:
Discuss reimbursement in the lit review/background to study.

Paragraph 2 -- clarify wet smear. Is this a Pap smear?

Last sentence -- expand the discussion on the use of nurses and provide some rationale. IE are the GPs too busy to address UI? engaging nurses is an excellent idea in primary care but insertion of these two sentences without discussion leaves the ideas dangling.

Conclusions: ? PCPs disease management?

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
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