Reviewer’s report

**Title:** Developing a questionnaire to identify perceived barriers for implementing the Dutch physical therapy COPD clinical practice guideline

**Version:** 1  **Date:** 22 November 2012

**Reviewer:** Signe Flottorp

**Reviewer’s report:**

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes, as far as I can assess, but I am not an expert on the methods used for factor analysis.

3. Are the data sound?
   The main limitations of the study is, as reported by the authors, the relatively low sample size of 139 participants, making the analysis less robust.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes, the discussion and conclusions are balanced, asking relevant questions regarding the lack of specific information to inform the development of an implementation strategy.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   The title is OK. The limitations of the study and the challenges of getting quite generic information which may not be particularly helpful when developing implementation strategies, are important issues discussed in the paper but missing in the abstract.
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