Reviewer's report

Title: Patchy 'coherence': using Normalization Process Theory to evaluate a multi-faceted shared decision making implementation programme (MAGIC)

Version: 1 Date: 10 May 2013

Reviewer: Isabelle Scholl

Reviewer's report:

General
Many thanks for the opportunity to review this paper. It is a clearly written manuscript addresses the important question on how to engage healthcare professionals in efforts to implement shared decision making in practice.

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. I found the aim stated in the manuscript a bit vague. E.g. in the abstract it is written that the aim is to “investigate perspectives on the impact of MAGIC’s interventions using evaluation data from interviews with healthcare professionals”. At the end of the introduction the authors write that the “aim in this article is to describe the results of interviews with clinicians, and to use a theoretical perspective on the data to examine what is required to engage health professionals in future efforts to implement and embed SDM.” Both these sentences also include the method used (interviews), which I consider unnecessary. If the aim of the study / the research question is stated more clearly, it would be easier for the reader to understand from the beginning on what the study is going to be about. Please consider rephrasing this part.

2. Related to this is the question on whether this paper is the main evaluation paper of the programme? The qualitative approach to data analysis is definitely a good one, but is there also quantitative data? Is it reported elsewhere?

3. There could be some more information on the research method (e.g. reason for choosing the particular research, maintenance of confidentiality, method of recording data, procedures for transcribing data, interview guide)

Minor Essential Revisions
4. For readers less familiar to the concept of shared decision making, it might be helpful to have a short definition at the beginning of the background section. On page 4 the authors do define the concept, but it might be beneficial to start the paper with a short definition / description.

5. At the end of the background section the Normalization Process Theory is first mentioned. The explanation only follows in the methods section. For readers unfamiliar with the theory this could be confusing. Maybe it is not necessary to mention NPT in the background section?

6. It would be helpful to have some more information on the MAGIC programme. E.g., some of the interventions of the MAGIC programme are mentioned several
times in the results and conclusions sections (e.g., Option Grids and DQMs). I understand that they are described in table 1, but I would find it helpful to briefly introduce these 2-3 interventions as examples in the main text too.

7. On page 4 the authors describe that they worked with three secondary care teams and four primary care teams. What is the rationale for only involving the former in this study?

8. On page 6 the authors describe that inter-coder agreement was calculated. However, I cannot find information on this in the results section. Please add this to the manuscript.

9. I found the structure of the Results and discussion vs. Conclusions sections a bit unusual. Maybe the authors could consider putting “principal findings”, “strengths and weaknesses of the study” and “comparison to existing literature” under Discussion and keep the Conclusion shorter?

10. I am not sure on whether I missed this information somewhere the results sections (apologies if I did), but I found the information at the end of page 13 (that the partial information was led mainly by nursing colleagues) new. Please make sure this information is also in the results section and not only in the Conclusions section.

11. Was there any thought given on a possible influence of the researchers on the data?

Discretionary Revisions

12. Please consider adding one sentence on the method of data analysis to the methods section of the abstract.

13. The methods section is nicely divided into subsections. I suggest also using a subheading at the beginning of that section, where the MAGIC programme is described (simply “The MAGIC programme” would do the trick for me).

14. On page 8 the authors mention “champions” without explaining what they mean by that. Being familiar with the MAGIC programme makes it easy to understand this term, but I wonder if that is the same for all readers.
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