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Dear Editors,

Thank you for the feedback provided on the revised version of our manuscript. The reviewer’s comments have been addressed as follow:

We have done an electronic search to ensure a consistency in the wording "specialty".

On p. 8, we have deleted the colon at "(e.g.: attitude ...)"

We have addressed the potential problem of the stability of the statistical solution in the light of reviewer’s comments. We agree that the regression solution could be unstable given the small sample and the high correlations between the IVs. We have thus conducted a series of verifications to ensure the stability of the solution in the ophthalmologists group. First, the number of IVs entered in the final equation is not 5 plus the interaction terms, but 3 since only the significant predictors were kept in the final regression. This partly limits the threat for an unstable solution (see p.8, Statistical analyses, second paragraph).

Second, we have conducted a multicollinearity diagnosis since an unstable solution is usually caused by multicollinearity\(^1\). The values for the variance inflation factors (VIF) were well below 10, that indicates no multicollinearity\(^2\).

Third, the reviewer mentions that our high R\(^2\) might reflect a problem of "over-fitting". Our response is that high R\(^2\)s have been reported in other studies using psychosocial theories such as the Theory of Planed Behaviour and the Theory of Interpersonal Behaviour. Also, in most of the studies using these models, psychosocial determinants of behavioural intention are highly correlated. Thus, we conclude that our model is likely to reflect a ‘true’ relationship between variables.

These points are discussed in detail in the 3\(^{rd}\) and 4\(^{th}\) paragraphs of the section Limitations of the study results on p. 12.

---


We have addressed the reviewer’s comments to the best of our knowledge and the revised manuscript should now be suitable for publication in the BioMed Central *Implementation Science*.

Sincerely,

Marie-Pierre Gagnon, Ph.D.
Evaluative Research Unit
Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Québec (CHUQ), Pavillon St-François d’Assise
10, rue de l’Espinay, D1-724
Québec (Québec)
G1L 3L5