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Reviewer's report:

Lungtenberg et al. have performed a study on exposure to and experience with a Dutch CDDS among general practices (GPs and NPs). The study was aimed to evaluate the impact of an intervention (alerts within CDSS concerning heart failure) by analysing differences between an exposed group (general practices using CDSS with these alerts) and a control group (general practices using CDSS without these alerts). Moreover the study collected information on experience with this CDSS in order to describe its usage and possible barriers. This study derives from a cluster randomised trial on the same CDSS.

Although data presented in this manuscript are not “exciting”, the study appears interesting and the discussed topic need to be study in deep to better design the future CDSSs.

Therefore, I have some major and minors suggestions to improve the manuscript.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Title: the study was not designed to improve the “quality of primary care” (as reported in the presented title). I suggest to focus the title on the level of use and barriers in the use of CDSS in primary care.

2. Results (general): in this section there are few results on the effect of the intervention on the two compared groups.

3. Discussion (general): Whereas a detailed discussion on the low level of use and possible barriers in the use of CDSS is presented, little importance is given to the findings on the effect of the intervention.

4. Discussion (general): In this section the authors should better emphasise the importance of their study on the developing of the future CDSSs on the basis of their results. Moreover, they should propose strategies to improve the use of CDSS among general practices.

5. Discussion (general): The authors should clarify the importance of their study on other CDSS (operating in other countries) different from that used in the analyse.

Minor Essential Revisions
1. Abstract (page 2 lines 32-34): the study aim appears vague; the authors should rephrase the sentence in the abstract, specifying their purpose (as reported at page 5 lines 111-112).

2. Abstract (page 2 lines 45): please include the crude figures beside the percentages

3. In different point of the manuscript the authors cite their unpublished (only submitted) article (see ref n. 15). Since, at this time, this work is not available, authors should provide more information on the analysed CDSS, and the used methodology.

4. Methods: the sentence at page 8 lines 178-179 appears in contrast with the sentence at page 7 lines 153-154. Please rephrase to better explain what general practices did not know about the intervention.

5. Results (Table 1): In tab 1 are reported 3 different groups of responders (Practices, GPs and PNs). It is not clear if the first group is the sum of the other two. The authors should rearrange the content of this table to better describe their results and consequently they should change the title of this table.
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