

Reviewer's report

Title: Measures for assessing practice change in medical practitioners

Version: 2 Date: 6 November 2006

Reviewer: David Kuykendall

Reviewer's report:

General

Minor revisions were made, although the link between previous reviews and the revisions was difficult to follow.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

As stated in the previous review (point 2), the importance of this study is unclear. For example, why is frequency of use important? What are the take-away points from this article.

From point 4 in previous review- it is not apparant that the link has been tightened with regard to contribution to the field, primary objective, study methodology, and potential limitations. I could not determine whether this point was addressed in the revision.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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