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November 13, 2013

Dear Armee,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide further revisions to our manuscript in response to the editor’s careful and thoughtful review of our manuscript. We sincerely appreciate the detailed suggestions for revision that we received. Please find a detailed description of how we have revised the manuscript in response to the editor’s feedback:

1. Page 3 line 10 identified extra comma
   Revised to remove extra comma

2. Page 3 line 20-21 suggested deleting “in general, over the last two decades”
   Revised to remove suggested text

3. Page 3 line 22 suggested changing “Most” to “Many and starting a new paragraph at this sentence
   Revised to substitute “Most” with “Many” and started a new paragraph as suggested

4. Page 3 line 26 suggested deleting text “at this level”
   Revised to delete suggested text

5. Page 3 line 27 suggested deleting “to achieve this within organizations”
   Revised to delete suggested text

6. Page 4 line 1 suggested beginning a new paragraph at “This may be…”
   Revised to start a new paragraph as suggested

7. Page 4 line 3 suggested changing “evidence” to “different” and replacing “they are different. For example, their patients” with "such as patient conditions that"
Revised to change text to suggested text

8. Page 4 line 4-5 suggested changing “little is known” to “guidelines have not been developed yet”
Revised to change text to suggested text

9. Page 4 line 10 add reference
Revised to include relevant reference

10. Page 6 line 14 suggested changing “involves” to “involved”
Revised to suggested text

11. Page 8 line 3 identified extra period
Revised to remove extra period

12. Page 8 line 11-12 suggested replacing “As mentioned above, a total of 3,584 decision-makers participated in these studies, which included” to “The studies comprised a wide range of decision-makers such as”
Revised to suggested text

13. Page 8 line 13 suggested adding “main” before “characteristics”
Revised to add suggested text

14. Page 8 line 16-20 suggested rewriting the following sentences as they are unclear: “Adhering to published guidelines for systematic reviews, the quality of the included studies was assessed using a mixed-methods assessment tool. This enabled studies to be compared using a single tool”
Rewrote these two sentences to improve clarity. Revised text is as follows:
“Adhering to published guidelines for systematic reviews, the quality of the included studies was assessed using a mixed-methods assessment tool. A single critical appraisal tool enabled the quality of the quantitative, qualitative and mixed-methods studies to be assessed, compared and summarized using a single tool.”

15. Page 8 line 24 requested more specific details on the studies that had methods that were poorly described
Revised text from “In many, methods were poorly described, leading to an ‘unclear’ rating.” to “As summarized in Table 2, the methods in all of the included studies were poorly described, leading to an ‘unclear’ rating for at least one of the methodological criteria assessment questions.”

16. Page 9 line 1 identified missing period
Revised to include period

17. Overall comment to ensure article meets formatting guidelines
Reviewed checklist for manuscript formatting and revised the title page to
remove author’s qualifications, revised superscripts to be numbers instead of letters and made separate superscripts for Corresponding and Senior Author. Also revised formatting of Table 1 and Table 2 so the pages are portrait rather than landscape

18. Review entire paper to improve the quality of the written English with particular attention to the abstract

We had a colleague review and edit the paper to improve the quality of the writing. Revisions were made to the abstract as well as throughout the paper, which did not affect the content, but improved the writing style.

Thank you again for the detailed feedback on the manuscript and for the opportunity to further revise the manuscript to make it the best possible piece of work for publication. We hope we have addressed all of your concerns and would be grateful to have you consider our manuscript for publication. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,
Serena Humphries