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November 16, 2011

Martin Eccles, MD, FMedSci, FRCP, FRCGP, FFPHM
Editor-in-Chief, Implementation Science
Professor
Newcastle University, UK

Dear Dr. Eccles,

Myself and my co-authors are submitting our revised study protocol (MS: 2068132652620315) of an audit with feedback intervention in home care and supportive living settings, which follows a controlled interrupted time series design. Our study is entitled: Data for Improvement and Clinical Excellence: Protocol for an audit with feedback intervention in home care and supportive living.

We would like to thank you and the reviewers for your comments and suggestions on the previous manuscript draft. We have addressed all suggestions, using track changes, and have given a point-by-point summary of our edits in the below table. We believe that the changes we have made have significantly clarified this study protocol, especially in terms of the methods and analysis sections.

This protocol is a funded study (CHSRF and AHFMR) and has received ethical approval from the University of Alberta.

This paper is not being submitted elsewhere for publication. All authors meet all requirements for authorship according to the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. Anne Sales, one of the manuscript co-authors, is an Associate Editor of Implementation Science. Neither myself nor my co-authors have any additional competing interests or conflicts of interest in terms of any relationship with funders or other entities to declare.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns. I look forward to hearing the results of the review process.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Fraser, RN, PhD
Faculty of Nursing
6-10 University Terrace
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
T6G 2T4
# Itemized Summary of Response to Reviews, by Reviewer Comment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer Comment</th>
<th>Summary of Response &amp; Manuscript page number(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whilst we recognize that this submission is linked to a previously published protocol, we feel that the cross referencing and your (honorable) attempt to avoid duplication has led to the description of methods appearing less than complete. Consequently, there is a risk of the reader only getting 'half a story'. We suggest that you revise and resubmit a protocol structured along the same lines as the one already published. In doing so, we would like you to include some limited cross referencing and to also ensure that both intervention and main outcomes are clearly defined.</td>
<td>We have added additional detail to the intervention and main outcomes including: ---Several edits made to headings so that they mirror the protocol paper in LTC. ---Additional detail added to the intervention (pp. 9-11) ---Additional detail added to the process evaluation, especially around the focus groups and the content of the post-feedback survey (pp. 11-13) ---Additional detail added to the analysis section, to more clearly explain the main, pooled time series analysis and the descriptive, site-specific accounts that will be developed from the more in-depth qualitative data and the post-feedback surveys (pp. 14-15) ---Section added on dissemination and spread to mirror that DICE-LTC protocol paper, referencing the DICE-LTC protocol paper (pp. 15-16) ---Have listed the specific deliverables for this project to mirror the DICE-LTC protocol paper, referencing the DICE-LTC protocol paper (pp. 16-17) Other details include: ---Mention of the KBG group within the project team description (pg 8) ---Have included a copy of the feedback report in the additional files (see additional file 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cochrane EPOC audit and feedback review has been updated and should probably be referenced in the introduction</td>
<td>Edit made as suggested. See reference #6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add the following conflict of interest statement ‘Anne Sales is an Associate Editor of Implementation Science; all decisions on this paper were made by another editor.’</td>
<td>Edit made as suggested. See page 17.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>