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Reviewer's report:

General
This a very good paper on an important subject. The idea derserve to be copied within other specialties in order to elucidate the problem if implementation on evidence based medicine in the daily practice.

The question posed is well defined, the methods are appropriate, the data seems sound and are well presented in the full text as well as in the abstract. The conclusion is well-founded

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

Did the OP´s seek the evidence as well also?
- The questions are very straight-forward with a yes/no. I wonder what the results would be if the questions were more complicated

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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