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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have made modifications regarding previous recommendations and now seems better.

Background (results section)

Major:

1. The practitioners in the focus groups reached a consensus as to the key elements to include in the instrument. We achieved a 73.1% (n= 57/78) initial response rate for our questionnaire; of these 57, 54 completed the questionnaire a second time.

Comments.

• See Table No. 1 of the results section: the frequency of respondents is 53 (67.9%). The number must correspond with that shown in the table.

2. Family physicians made up the largest single group of respondents (47.4%, n=27), with more female (64.9%, n=37) than male (35.1%, n=20) respondents.

Comments.

• Improve the wording of this section. Specify if the percentage corresponding to the initial response of the participants and the proportions of male and female are total participants of the first round.

3. The QICKD-CCQ is a reliable instrument for measuring confidence and knowledge among primary care practitioners on CKD management in the context of UK primary care.

Comments.

• This abbreviation has not been properly described in the summary and therefore can confuse the reader. This abbreviation suggests that the instrument measures the improvement in the quality of care and confidence vs. competence and knowledge.

• I suggest use the title of the instrument provided in the Answer reviewer: Clinical knowledge and Confidence Questionnaire (CCQ).


• Online version of the instrument in the title of paragraph No. 5: the word lifestyle is included. The instrument does not measure lifestyle. I think you must remove...
this word.

Results section.

5. General practitioners who are partners and salaried GP’s made up the largest single group of respondents (47.4%, n= 27) followed by nurses (26.7%, n=16). Locums and trainees made up the smallest group of respondents (Table 1).

Comments.
• The proportion of nurses in the wording does not match the frequency in the table No. 1: 26.7% vs 28.1%.

6. The proportion of nurses in the wording does not match the table: 26.7% vs 28.1%. There were more female respondents (64.9%, n=37) than male (35.1%, n=20) (Table 2). More of the female respondents of this sample are in the older age bands and all the nurses are female (26.7%, n=16).
• Same mistake

7. References.


Comments.
• Update references: Kidney International (2013) 84, 609–620; doi:10.1038/ki.2013.96; published online 27 March 2013


Comments.
• Use the same format for writing references.

Discussion. Principal findings

1. The QICKD Clinician Confidence and Knowledge Questionnaire (CCQ) appears to be a reliable instrument in testing confidence and knowledge in the management of CKD vs CCQ.

Comments.
• Unify the name of the instrument throughout the article. View background sections and discussions.

Minor:

Background section.

1. In the UK, chronic disease, including chronic kidney disease (CKD) is largely managed in primary care. We developed a tool to assess practitioner confidence...
and knowledge in assessing CKD compared to other chronic cardiovascular diseases. This tool was part of a cluster randomised quality improvement interventions in chronic kidney disease (QICKD; ISRCTN56023731).

Comments.

• I have reviewed some previous articles of the authors, in which they describe only the term chronic disease, which I think is better.
• This abbreviation is not informative to the reader with the study objective and diminishes the relevance of the current study. I think must be remove this abbreviation.

2. Keywords.

Kidney Failure, Chronic; Blood pressure; Primary Care; Questionnaire; Quality of Healthcare.

Comments.

• Search keywords more appropriate to the purpose of the study. I suggest the following confidence, knowledge, CKD, chronic diseases and primary care.
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