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Reviewer's report:

- Discretionary Revisions
1. Authors should consider combining the first part of the Results section (up to ‘Experiences in Using Tools for EIDM’) with the current Methods sections. The Results section would then consist of information about the usability and usefulness of the tools adapted for the case study, which is the case study’s stated purpose (see last paragraph of Background).
2. Since the study by Greco et al. (submitted 2014) has not been published nor, apparently, accepted for publication, it may be better to briefly summarize that intervention study. If the article is accepted or published before this manuscript is, the sentence can be revised.
3. Define ‘usability’ and ‘usefulness’ up front.
4. Revise last sentence of Results (in Abstract) to: “Decision-makers provided descriptions of how the tools were used within the health departments, and made suggestions for improvement. Overall, the tools were perceived as valuable for advancing and sustaining evidence-informed decision-making.”
5. In Conclusion of Abstract, the second sentence has a plural noun so the verb should be a plural form as well.
6. In the first sentence of Background, same is true of ‘the provision of …public health services.’ In second sentence, consider adding ‘public health,’ too.
7. First sentence in paragraph beginning “Conversely, EIBDM can be…” authors may consider using “‘…facilitated by a competent workforce, the necessary infrastructure and a supportive organization.’” unless the reference specifically uses the term in this sentence.
8. In the first sentence of the next paragraph, is there just one reference [24] that authors found for this statement? In the next sentence authors refer to ‘Health Department A’ yet under Study Design authors referred to ‘Case A.’
9. In summarizing qualitative data, under ‘Easing the Process of EIDM,’ authors stated that “The tools …appeared to further facilitate…” Not sure this convinces me.
10. Under ‘Increasing Confidence,’ the word ‘confidence is used 4 times in the narrative and 3 times in the quoted statements. Then, in the Discussion (‘The final theme..’), it is used five more times. May be overused.
11. Under Discussion, avoid repeating what has been clearly stated before (e.g.,
“In this case study, a KB worked with three Ontario health departments to build capacity for EIDM.”).

12. In same section, can authors prove that the actions taken were ‘critical’ for facilitating…?

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**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.
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