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Reviewer's report:

The authors conducted a systematic review of interventions to enhance guideline adherence among dental practitioners. They clearly outline the need for their review and use the gathered data to call for more efforts in this area to improve the quality of care in their specialty. The paper is well written and they have done a very nice job of making the design and content easy to follow. I only have a few minor questions/concerns:

1. It wasn't completely clear to me why they excluded papers that had "guideline dissemination as part of the intervention" in line 113 by stating that the comparison group had not been exposed to the guidelines. Are they trying to say that there are papers where some practitioners were unaware of the guidelines and so couldn't implement them for patients? Are they saying the intervention took place before guidelines existed so it wasn't a fair comparison? Please clarify

2. on line 117, they excluded "participants with another medical specialization related to the mouth but not considered a dental practitioner." Does this mean they excluded any paper with an author who wasn't a dental practitioner or that they excluded papers where the setting of patient care/intervention was a non-dental specialist?

3. For their search strategy, they describe using the word "dentist" but did they also include "dental" or "dent*" as a way to ensure complete capture of relevant articles?

4. They describe assessment of study quality by one reviewer and then review by a second author. Does this mean that the second author saw the first author's review before conducting his/her own review? If so, please explain why they chose not to have two independent reviews that could then be compared, rather than risking bias by letting reviewer 2 see reviewer 1's thoughts.

5. On line 190, they mention weaknesses of the RCT's include lack of blinding. Please comment on whether blinding was feasible in those circumstances.

6. One useful point would be to know whether the interventions in their included articles were implemented with reasonable fidelity. Did any of the papers evaluate fidelity? If so, please include this information in the summaries of study outcomes.
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