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Reviewer’s report:

Implementation of new methods in care are important and a complicated issue. There is a need for research in this area.

The present study used a qualitative design to study implementation of a new computer based life style test. Six primary care units were engaged and three received an explicit strategy while three received an implicit strategy. We already know from the literature that implicit strategies do not work very well.

Only one of the care units adopted the new method and thus the units were divided in three groups explicit A, explicit NA and implicit NA.

Only one of the explicit units adopted the new method. From the tables it seems that one of the explicit NA units had no manager. One (or the same) has had a lot of district nurses on sick leave. Thus it seemed that there had been a lack of manager and personnel in at least one of the explicit NA units. Leadership has previously been reported to be of importance in the implementation process.

In the result section some changes between the explicit units are described and it seems obvious that they were different. How was it in the implicit units?

This contextual difference was probably very important for the implementation process. In the conclusion nothing is mentioned about the context.

The analysis of the focus groups included an observation about the interaction between the respondents. In the result it is stated that they helped each other to relate to the issues in the discussion and that no major disagreements were revealed. On a primary care unit there might be a hierarchy, was this visible in the discussions? Did this differ at the six units? Nothing is said about the professions of those attending the focus groups or those being interviewed. They all met patients but they could have been physicians, nurses, physiotherapists etc. Did the results differ in the different professions?
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