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Reviewer's report:

The present study aimed to investigate the complementary value of DCE for the evaluation of barriers and facilitators in implementation research. Many aspects of the manuscript are difficult to follow, including the specific guideline being targeted, the DCE approach, methods (all subjects given both approaches), and the analytic approach (the two approaches were not compared), thus it is difficult to judge the importance of the study and findings.

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. The guideline being targeted is not entirely clear in the manuscript. The investigators refer to it as a guideline for breast cancer surgery in day care, but precisely what does that mean?
2. The sample included anesthesiologists, oncologists, and nurses, each of whom assumably has a different role in implementing aspects of the guideline. However, each role is not clear given that the guideline itself is not well described.
3. The sample was not random and therefore suffers from selection bias.
4. The investigator should cite the origin of the “traditional” survey. Has this been used in the past? What makes it the “traditional” approach?
5. The authors report feasibility in terms of time spent, difficulty level, and appropriateness but do not appear to compare these across the two different approaches, so it remains unknown which is more appropriate.

Level of interest: Reject as not of sufficient priority to merit publishing in this journal

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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