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Reviewer's report:

Major Revisions

This could be an important study.
Does identifying barriers to change and tailoring education to break down those barriers improve implementation of guidelines?
The study would help to identify the barriers but what specific support will they be given to surmount the barriers?
Some areas are very wordy and make the important issues hard to follow.
I feel that the paper needs to focus on only the important areas of the project and specifically only on those with LVSD causing their heart failure because there is no real evidence base for treatment for those with CHF due to diastolic heart failure.
I am concerned that there is no reference to patient consent where patients are completing questionnaires which form the outcome for the study.
There are some linguistic issues for example in the Abstract 'CHF is a prevalent disease' but a common condition, and not 'To improve primary care for CHF' but 'to improve the management of CHF in primary care'. There are similar issues throughout the paper I am afraid too many to itemise in this way it would need suggestions making with track changes ie a rewrite.
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