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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your paper. The topic is important and the work you have done is considerable.

I have the following comments:

1. Please edit the paper carefully for spelling and grammar.

2. Page 3, lines 54 to page 4, line 4 reads like a statement, and one would hope that it is also something that is taken for granted by the readership. This could be formulated differently and shortened considerably.

3. The methods - there is discussion of different levels of healthcare, national, provincial and so on, but no contextualisation of this for the readership. This should be included. Also, it seems that the participants were from different provinces - is this correct? Please give us more detail of how your participants were geographically spread in South Africa.

4. Related to the above, what kind of guidelines are available for allied health practitioners in primary care? A table of both allied health professionals working within primary care and the guidelines available/relevant to them could be included.

5. One of the two main problems I have with the manuscript: Who are your interviewees? The aim of your study is "to provide a description of the factors that contribute to, or hinder, the development, uptake, and usage of CPGs within allied health practice in South Africa". Table 1 details the interviewees, of whom none seem to be practitioners in primary care clinics in South Africa. So in effect you are reporting on managers and
policymakers' views of what hinders the uptake and usage. Why were no grass roots level participants included in this study?

6. What language were the interviews done in?

7. Related to the above, much of the results seems to be reporting how managers view processes, uptake and usage. If that is your aim, fine, but your aim sets one up for expecting how this happens from the perspective of those who receive the guidelines and who use them. You should modify either the aim or the results.

8. Page 6, lines 57-60: you include a quote about the term allied health. The purpose of this is unclear: your paper is not about terminology, or people's experiences of allied health. It does not add to the paper content.

9. Page 9, line 41. Influence and ability to Place clinical guidelines on the political agenda - again, this seems like a strange expectation for a primary care clinic practitioner. Is your paper actually about policymakers and health services managers?

10. The second large problem with this study is the discussion. Currently, there is no summary or answer to the aim, of what factors hindered or supported the development, uptake and use of CPGS. just one paragraph relating the findings to international literature. The other two paragraph introduce something completely new, that comes out of the blue and introduces something called tiers. This tier thinking is then continued till the end of discussion. The introduction of something new is not what a discussion should do. On reading the latter two paragraphs, I get the feeling that the discussion is used for advertising courses and other work done.

11. Besides for one reference to a paper in review from 2016, most of the references are far older than that.
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