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Author's response to reviews: see over
Response to the comments
Below, we present a point-by-point response to the comments of the reviewers. After repeating each comment of the reviewers, we present in italics our answer to the comment followed by any changes we made.

ESSENTIAL REVISIONS

Description of methods: Furthermore, while a figure describing stages of the research is important for the reader to help follow the flow of findings, it does not make sense that Figure 1 focuses on the number of residents recruited and included in the study because none of the paper’s findings are based on data from resident questions. Resident outcomes are used only peripherally to identify successful or non-successful facilities. I recommend restructuring Figure 1 to identify how staff and managers, instead of residents, were incorporated in the project at each stage. Also, not all the labels in figure 1 were readable in the copy I had.

Answer:

*We agree that the data to answer the research questions were mainly derived from staff and management interviews. We therefore omitted the figure 1. Instead of making a new figure we described elaborately the recruited and interviewed persons in the results section.*

DISCRETIONARY REVISIONS

Discussion and conclusions: Conclusions could be stated more strongly and in particular, wording “were comparable” in first sentence is not sufficiently clear. Also, link conclusions back to the initial use of the Grimshaw model as discussed in the introduction. Is it expected or not that the facilitators and barriers were the same in the initial and continuing phases of implementation?

Answer:

*We replaced ‘were comparable’ in the first sentence of Conclusions by: “were basically the same”.*

*In addition we included edits as follow

4 lines further:

*Facilitating factors as positive opinions and support of managers is in both phases of great importance. Our findings are in line with the conclusion of Grimshaw that the implementation of clinical guidelines within a clinical governance setting requires time, enthusiasm, and resources.*

The last sentence: *The impeding factors as shortage of time and insufficient equipment that we found in both phases which frustrated the process may be typical for the Dutch circumstances in long term care facilities.*