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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this interesting article. I found this article to be a useful case study of the implementation issues encountered in using patient decision aids in real world clinical setting. I have some minor comments on the writing and the manuscripts content that believe should be addressed before publication:

1. it seems that paragraph 1 page seven describing the NPT and it constructs could be combined the description of the theoretical framework on page 9. I think it would be helpful for readers unfamiliar with the model to provide some concrete examples of each construct in practice and how they are delineated - i.e. what is an example of something that constitutes "sense making" vs something that constitutes "reflexive monitoring" vs cognitive participation - the distinction are not clear in the manuscript right now.

2. in the results section there is no "Table 1" describing your participants, i recognize that in many qualitative studies this not done but in the interview guide you asked how long have you been using option grids it would be informative to provide this data to readers on the mean and sd or more like if not normally distributed median and range of participants use of the tool - if not in a table then in the text.

3. in the results section theme 2 the section begins "The brief nature of the Option Grid decision aid and their perceived fit into clinical workflows were reported as key factors promoting adoption." but the quotes provided do not seem to support this finding - they largely point to barriers, this should be addressed with appropriate dat if available or regions of this section.

4. in the results section page 16 - the following paragraph--- "Collective Action: the operational work that enables the enactment of the intervention."

These data confirm that the collective action to help fit the Option Grid into the clinical pathway was a major contributor to implementation at HealthPartners, and at some
CapitalCare sites. CapitalCare management was able to introduce the decision aids in a sufficiently practical manner, and clinicians were willing to code their use in the electronic health record. Pre-visit planning by nurses at both CapitalCare and at HealthPartners helped support the intervention’s adoption. In summary, at both settings, we saw evidence of collective action to adopt the tools by a range of professionals with different roles in the organizations.

seems to be without any supporting data - is it its own theme? or part of theme 2 or theme 3 , its unclear to me

5. in general the results section needs reworking so that for each assertion made in each theme there is supporting data provided , right now it is hard to read and ink the findings with the supporting data

6. in the discussion section the strengths and limitation are put into one paragraph it would better if these were separated and normally this paragraph comes after you discuss your findings in relation to other's prior work although you have done some of this in your discussion it would be easier to read and follow if this were a specific paragraph after a review of the main findings of your study

7. one limitation f this study not mentioned appears to be that you did not assess whether clinicians are using option grids only with patients they believe to be high numeracy/ literacy - if your encounter data related t this question in your interview i suggest adding it to the results if not discuss as a limitation

8. finally since this is an informatics journal there is not discussion of that role that healthcare information technology might play in addressing the implementation issues encountered - could patients use their PHR to review option grids prior to appointments? could these be tailored to literacy/ numeracy? would providers benefit form decision support to remind them to engage in SDM ? - what are the barriers motivators for that ? there are many possibilities that might interest readers if this journal that should be added to the discussion
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