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Dear editor,

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to revise our manuscript ‘Exposure to and experiences with a computerized decision support intervention in primary care: results from a process evaluation’ and to resubmit it to BMC Family Practice.

We have addressed the useful comment of reviewer 1 in the revised manuscript and included a response below. Reviewer 2 and reviewer 3 had no further comments. We therefore hope you will find our revised manuscript acceptable for publication and look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

On behalf of all authors,

Marjolein Lugtenberg

Scientific center for care and welfare (Tranzo),
Tilburg School of Social and Behavioral Sciences
Tilburg University
P.O. Box 90153
5000 LE Tilburg
The Netherlands
m.lugtenberg@tilburguniversity.edu
Response to reviewers’ comments

Reviewer 1

Title: Exposure to and experiences with a computerized decision support intervention in primary care: results from a process evaluation

Version: 3 Date: 7 September 2015

Reviewer: Kathrin Schlößler

Reviewer’s report:

Dear Authors

Thank you for your answer and significant work and changes in your manuscript. I appreciate the revision according to my comments Nr 3-12 (Comments one and two were only general remarks).

Discretionary Revisions However I would like to ask you to include your comments on remark n.7..

("We agree that the number of 300 requests send per week was indeed relatively low. However, in interpreting this number it is important to realize that the different domains/disease areas do not result in different alerts each. Rather, the advices are combined in one alert, consisting of an alert window with different tab pages for all relevant domains/disease areas.")

....... in the discussion section- as the number is an indicator of actual implementation and as your additional information was quite helpful.

Response: We agree with the reviewer that it is useful to include the above stated comment in the manuscript and have therefore added it to the Discussions section (p.18; line 429-432).

All in all I recommend for publication.

Kind regards,

Kathrin Schlößler

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
Declaration of competing interests: No competing interests
I participate in the non-profit- development of the electronic decision aid (arriba / PSA-screening).
Reviewer 2

Title: Exposure to and experiences with a computerized decision support intervention in primary care: results from a process evaluation

Version: 3 Date: 1 September 2015

Reviewer: Carlo Piccinni

Reviewer's report:

The authors reviewed the manuscript according to all suggestions and answered the questions given.

The revised version of the manuscript is improved and therefore I recommend its publication in your journal.

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
Declaration of competing interests: I declare that I have no competing interests

Reviewer 3

Title: Exposure to and experiences with a computerized decision support intervention in primary care: results from a process evaluation

Version: 3 Date: 3 September 2015

Reviewer: Yinsheng Zhang

Reviewer's report:

The questions and problems have been answered or revised.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.