

## **Reviewer's report**

**Title:** Why don't physicians adhere to guideline recommendations in practice? An analysis of barriers among Dutch general practitioners

**Version:** 1 **Date:** 5 May 2009

**Reviewer:** Kate McLintock

### **Reviewer's report:**

Summary- The authors analysed the barriers a group of GPs believed limited the implementation of a set of clinical guidelines developed by a single organisation. They examined barriers at the level of individual, key recommendations rather than the guideline as a whole. Key recommendations were identified and examined in peer groups through semi-structured discussion. Results were analysed and classified according to the framework of Cabana et al, new categories were developed for themes identified which lay outside the existing domains of this model. Specific barriers relating to overarching themes of knowledge, attitude and behaviour were identified and the authors suggested interventions tailored to these factors may improve implementation of key guideline recommendations.

Major Compulsory Revisions –The authors should be more explicit about the aims of this paper and what it adds to the existing literature. My understanding is that by analysing multiple key recommendations from a set of guidelines the authors aimed to identify which barriers occur most frequently across the collection. This information is useful for the authors of this paper and those who developed the guidelines examined and may also signpost other guideline programmes.

The authors comment that 'the findings from our study can be used as input for designing tailored implementation strategies,' but stop short of specifying who would utilise the study findings – the authors of the paper, other researchers, the authors of the guidelines examined, practitioners or other guideline developers? The authors should be more precise about the potential value of this work to the wider audience.

The authors mention that this paper will inform the development of multifaceted interventions, but need to consider this further. Are there other purposes the work may serve?

Minor Essential Revisions - Replacement of the term 'well-performing' (page 11, lack of self efficacy), with an appropriate synonym. Review grammar.

Discretionary Revisions – Some lack of clarity page 9 in the paragraph headed perceived barriers.

Comments

- The question was well defined, but the aims should be clarified.
- Methods clear, adequate and in sufficient detail.
- Data appears sound and well controlled.
- Reporting and data deposition should perhaps provide numbers in addition to percentages.
- Discussion and conclusions primarily descriptive rather than analytical. However, the conclusions drawn were adequately supported by the data presented. The authors utilised and commented on an existing framework and literature, but appeared to stop short of expanding the concepts or generating further hypotheses.
- Title and abstract summarise the paper effectively.
- On the whole writing and language is acceptable. Recommend review of grammar.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests.