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Reviewer's report:

This study aims to evaluate the scripts and thresholds that GPs use to diagnose heart failure patients. The paper is well written and clear in structure. Nevertheless, the level of relevance of this paper is not clear to me. The authors state that it hasn't been evaluated whether the algorithms and clinical decision rules are used in everyday clinical practice, but in how far does that impact the practice? How big is the problem? What do the authors conclude from their findings. What do they conclude from their findings of no difference in diagnostic threshold between trainers and trainees. The authors need to do a better job in bringing their results into context.

Did the authors inform the participants of the studies aim? which information did they provide? If so, do the authors think that this could have influenced the participants in their response?

Power size calculation: please provide information on that point.

Figure 1 is not visible and cannot be evaluated.
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Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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

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

Unable to assess

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:
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