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**Reviewer’s report:**

Major compulsory revisions:

1. This is not a meta-analysis, as stated in the title. Rather it is an extremely detailed review of the literature. A true meta analysis would use data from each of the studies to produce overall estimates of the number of physicians citing each barrier. Authors must recast this as a review of the literature or conduct the necessary statistical analyses for a meta analysis.

2. There is no information given on how the quality of each of the included studies was assessed. Was the study regional or national in scope? If a questionnaire was used, it the study employ a defensible sampling strategy, and what was the response rate? The authors should provide this information to the readers, if not in the text, than in a technical appendix.

3. The authors should do more in the conclusion to discuss the policy implications of their findings. Is the current policy push going to be enough to overcome these barriers? Are some barriers more important to target than others?

Minor Essential Revisions:

The authors should consider using a copy editor. The language in the paper is somewhat difficult to read and could use some clarifying.

**Level of interest:** An article of insufficient interest to warrant publication in a scientific/medical journal

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

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