**Author’s response to reviews**

**Title:** A Realist Review of Interventions and Strategies to promote evidence-informed health care: A Focus on Change Agency

**Authors:**

brendan g mccormack (bg.mccormack@ulster.ac.uk)
joanne rycroft-malone (j.rycroft-malone@bangor.ac.uk)
kara deKorby (decorbk@mcmaster.ca)
Alison Hutchinson (alison.hutchinson@deakin.edu.au)
Tracey Bucknall (tracey.bucknall@deakin.edu.au)
Bridie Kent (brigid.kent@plymouth.ac.uk)
Alyce Schultz (alyceaschultz@gmail.com)
Erna Snelgrove-clarke (erna.snelgrove-clarke@dal.ca)
Cheryl stetler (cheryl.stetler@comcast.net)
Marita titler (mtitler@umich.edu)
Lars Wallin (lars.wallin@ki.se)
Valerie Wilson (ValerieW@chw.edu.au)

**Version:** 5  **Date:** 19 July 2013

**Author’s response to reviews:**

Change 'Introduction and Background' to 'Background.' - DONE

The abstract and text mention that you identified over 20,000 hits. I think the convention is to state the precise number of hits, otherwise it may reduce readers' trust in the process and undermine (in theory) reproducibility. If you did not record the precise number, just say so. - EXACT NUMBER INSERTED

I think this needs to properly cited; if I don't pick it up, our copy-editors will: "In this review we followed a process, which is now detailed in published reporting standards of realist reviews:

Under 'Limitations' you start: "The limitations of this study relate to the review period, the quality of included papers and issues related to the lack of theory in published papers.” You just need to add some additional signposting words in relation to the sensitivity of the search strategy. - DONE