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Reviewer’s report:

This manuscript presents work to translate and evaluate an "Attitudes Towards Guidelines Scale" that has been used in other countries to assess medical providers' attitudes about medical guidelines. The introduction and methods are fairly clear and the translation process is well presented. However, the analyses conducted were not appropriate and did not follow modern recommendations.

MAJOR:

- Specifically, the authors split the sample and then conducted exploratory analysis on both samples, then a confirmatory analysis on the whole sample. They should have used one sample for exploratory analysis and the second sample for confirmatory analysis. Or, given that this scale is already established, simply tested the model structure that is already published in the literature in a confirmatory analysis on the whole sample.

- The "exploratory factor analysis" (EFA) was in fact a principal component analysis (PCA). These are not the same methods, and the PCA is not appropriate here.

- Both the PCA and the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) were conducted in software (SPSS and AMOS) that cannot conduct the appropriate analyses for these kinds of data. The Likert scale means that the item responses are not continuous (as SPSS and AMOS assume), but are ordered categorical responses. Software such as Mplus is able to appropriately model the item responses for this kind of scale.

- Contemporary model fit guidelines were not followed in this paper - for example, the current consensus is not to use measures like GFI (Sharma, Mukherjee, Kumar, & Dillon, 2005). Please see Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. Structural Equation Modeling, 6, 1-55.

- The discrepancy found in factor structure of the scale may be due to the fact that incorrect analyses were conducted. These analyses and results will need to be revised.

MINOR:
There are many typos and grammatical errors throughout the manuscript.
e.g., line 10 of "background", "The use of guidelines has shown to improve..." missing the word "been".

e.g., line 12 of "study sample": "...so totally sixteen hospitals were selected in the study." Should be "A total of 16 hospitals were selected to participate in the study."

e.g., line 32 of "results": "Group A has 380 samples and Group B has 388 samples." Should be "Group A has a sample size of 380 and Group B has a sample size of 388."

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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