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Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors

Thank you for a very interesting article that will definitely stimulate more dialogue and debate. I have the following queries/comments for this study:

1. The distinction between evidence-based and evidence informed is not addressed in this article.


3. How does the scope of practice in the identified health disciplines, specifically the overlap in certain areas of the scope of practice further contribute to challenges in developing these guidelines?

4. What are the inhibiting factors that impede multi-stakeholder input into developing clinical practice guidelines. You have alluded to this in your report but this needs to be made more clear?

5. How does health resource allocation; budgetary constraints or health policy priorities impact on the feasibility and practicality of implementing clinical practice guidelines? Again, the arguments presented, need to be strengthened and expanded.

6. The last two paragraphs in the Discussion section does not add to the flow of the overall argument presented. The purpose of this paper is to elicit stakeholder perspectives on
development and implementation of clinical practice guidelines. The framework proposed by the authors is vague with a fragmented rationale.

7. How was credibility, transformability and dependability of the collected data determined?

8. Some of the references used are outdated. Please address this.
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