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Reviewer’s report:

Dear authors,

The manuscript presents an interesting subject, to investigate the influence of feedback and audit on professionals and their intentions to change practice, contributing for effectiveness this practice widely used. However, there are short areas that I consider necessary some clarifications. There are two points for revision in the abstract. 1) It isn't clear when did the collection take place. Please, clarify, or at least clarify that during the experiment the toolbox was inaccessible to professionals, such as is in "study setting" in the main manuscript. 2) What are 'post-intentional' barriers? I think this expression couldn't be clear to the readers. The expression 'post-intentional barriers' would be obvious to the reader?

Moreover, in general, it wasn't clear if there was any qualitative analysis from the theoretical framework (5) or if it only supported the discussions.
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