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**Reviewer's report:**

The topic is clearly of interest to family medicine and primary care in general. The background is well written, setting the stage for why the study was done.

Abstract: The results section of the abstract is written so poorly it is nearly impossible to understand. It could be that the author is not a native English speaker, in which case he or she should seek some help writing this manuscript.

I have several important questions about the methodology that would need to be addressed to fully interpret the strength of the findings:

The survey itself: There was some content validity and some piloting described, but no validity testing the pre-defined cutoff scores that were used by the authors (7 for understanding and 18 for attitude, 12 for subjective norms). The authors should justify how the threshold scores were determined and if these thresholds underwent any sort of validity testing. Importantly, were these thresholds determined before or after the survey was conducted? The methods read as though the authors picked these somewhat randomly.

The sampling frame: How was the sample size of 2000 chosen? How many total members in the TAFP pool, that is, this 2000 is out of how many total? Was this based on a sample size analysis or were the authors hoping to sample a certain percentage of the TAFP?

Details on the survey distribution: How was it sent? Paper in the mail, paper in person, electronic? How many reminders were sent? Was there any incentive? Why did the survey period cover 14 months? It is very unusual for a single survey to be distributed over that long a time period. I am not sure you can even say cross-sectional when it was over such a larger period of time.

The discussion repeats a lot of what is already in the tables and it is hard to read. This section could be shortened by simply mentioning the highlights and referring to the tables.

The discussion also reads more like a review of the literature overall than putting the current findings into the context of the literature. I think much of this either belongs in the background section or needs to be removed because it is not directly applicable to the findings of this study. The methodology, a survey, can only give correlations so making statements beyond correlation is suspect. Because of this fact, I think the authors overstate some of the implications of their findings.

The findings are not really very surprising. That, of course, does not mean they are not interesting or important. I suggest more on what the authors suggest we do with this data.
Tables. There is really no need to go out to 4 decimal places. Putting two decimal places are enough, perhaps when appropriate putting $p<0.001$ is fine.

**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.

Yes

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

Yes

**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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