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Reviewer's report:

General
This is a descriptive account of FP's views on academic detailing in Canada. It is less innovative then the authors think, because more has been written on it. But there certainly are few published articles on this issue. There are two major limitations to this study. First is the low and skewed response rates, that threaten the validity and reliability of the answers. Low response rates are in particular for survey studies such as this a serious threat. The authors completely ignore this.

Secondly the authors have chosen a very pragmatic instead of theoretical approach. It is unclear how the determinants were selected, but it seems from common sense and/ or what the researchers/ developers of the intervention assume to be relevant aspects. Many theories exist in the social sciences that would have provided more depth (see for example Grol et al book on implementation science). Therefore the study is scientifically of limited value and the results are difficult to interpret in a broader perspective

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
Discussion of the major limitation of this study, the low response rate, and the skewed response rate of the users and non-users of academic detailing. And wat this means for the interpretation of the results. In fact, I think the response rate is too low to provide adequate answers to the questions.

Secondly, I would like to see the selection of determinants explained and would recommend to place them in a more theoretical perspective.

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Reject because scientifically unsound

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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