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Author's response to reviews:

Thank you for the feedback from the two reviewers. Their comments and suggestions have been reviewed with appropriate revisions made to strengthen our paper entitled "Adoption and sustainability of decision support for patients facing health decisions: An implementation case study in nursing."

The following is the response to the reviewers' comments

Reviewer IR - no changes required

Reviewer BH
1. Major Compulsory Revision: There is some obscurity concerning the number of informants concerning the information in the abstract and table 1. In the abstract the authors state that 11 nurses had used the decision support protocol and 22 intended to do it, e.g. 11+22=33. This information can be misleading because it is not clear how the four key informants are accounted for. How many informants participated in the study?

Response: These results were describing the 25 nurses' responses to 2 different questions and not intended to be added. The four key informants did not answer the structured questionnaire and therefore, are not included within this finding.

Newly revised abstract: "Twenty-five of 31 nurses responded to the survey measuring adoption of decision support in practice. Of the 25 nurses, 11 had used the decision support protocol in their practice within one month of the intervention. Twenty-two of the 25 intended to use it within the next three months."

2. Major Compulsory Revision: In a similar way, it is unclear about how the document review is included in the data collection as well as in the analysis. The information from the documents in the first part of the result is however valuable in understanding the result from the specific contextual concern.

Response: The types of documents collected are described within the methods section. The following statement has been added to the analysis section of the paper:
"Participants were sent summaries of the results from the interviews and focus groups in which they participated and were asked to verify their accuracy. Key organizational documents were analyzed to develop a rich description of the organization and to highlight concurrent activities that may have influenced the study."

3. Discretionary Revisions: Table 3 is informative but the understanding had been facilitated in the discussion had been structured from the content in the table instead of new headings.

Response: Table 3 fits with the theoretical framework that guided the study and the results subsection titled "What factors are likely to influence the sustainability of values-sensitive decision support by call centre nurses?" It was not intended to summarize the discussion. The table and the discussion section were not changed.

Please note that if approved for publication, permission will be sought from the Canadian Journal of Nursing Research for the figure included on the Ottawa Model of Research Use. We are hopeful that we have satisfactorily responded to the reviewer feedback and look forward your decision about proceeding to publish this manuscript.