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Reviewer’s report:

Discretionary revisions

1) This is a straightforward, clearly written qualitative evaluation of a piece of software. These evaluations are somewhat limited, as the authors would well know, as it is unclear whether the use of this electronic decision support tool will be maintained by the GPs. This is particularly the case if it is not adopted by all GPs and practice nurses within one practice. There are many examples in the literature of people trying out a new IT tool, finding it works, only to drop it later. This is especially so if it is not fully integrated with day to day clinical software. At least this one is integrated. I therefore wonder if the authors might comment on how this EDS might fare in an environment where other tools might compete, such as the RACGP PrimaryCare Sidebar.

I wonder if the authors would also consider the following minor amendments:

2) Is it possible to describe the EDS tool in a bit more detail? The reader can gain only a vague notion of how it works, given the current description. It might be possible to describe this within a box. Obviously, one prerequisite for software is that it should be easy to use. (The authors describe other requirements as well).

3) Were there any characteristics of participating practices – and non-participating ones for that matter – that might explain the uptake and use? For example, in the practices where there were the two nurses (I presume they were from different practices although this was not that clear), were the nurses the ‘drivers’?

4) Some acknowledgement at the end of the paper that quantitative measurements of changes in GP activities or patient data, using a more rigorous study design, might be a helpful additional form of evaluation. This is stating the obvious but I think the paper should state this.
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