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Author’s response to reviews:

Many thanks for your comments which have helped us to improve substantially the quality and readability of our manuscript. Please see below our response to your comment.

Comment:

Thank you for making revisions. I think the manuscript has more clarity.

Line 351 starts a paragraph with 'the literature showed that interactive traditional learning was more effective than passive guideline dissemination'.

I am confused by this statement - what is 'the literature' that is being referred to? I am not sure if it is the results of this systematic review or another literature. If it is another literature please give a reference for this claim.

Response:

Thank you for your comment. We refer to the existing systematic reviews focusing on traditional forms of guideline dissemination. We mention and cite them in the Introduction (page 4, lines 90 – 93).
We have now revised this sentence in the Discussion and cited relevant literature (page 14, lines 351 – 353):

“The existing literature on the effectiveness of traditional learning on clinical practice guidelines adoption shows that interactive approaches may be more effective than passive guideline dissemination [10,11]”