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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for your sharing your paper describing case studies on evaluating the where Option Grid decision aids have become 'normalized'. I found the qualitative findings resonating with my own experiences implementing PDA systems to support SDM. I appreciated the efforts by the authors to reduce bias and adopt a methodology design to ensure trustworthiness of the qualitative data and interpretation.

I was disappointed to find the lack of quantitative usage data for the Option Grids as it could have complimented the qualitative data - although this is beyond the scope of the current report. Perhaps future work could take advantage of Capital Care's participation in the CPCI to look at usage data over time in the context of the case study described here. Per the CPCI evaluation reports, Capital Care was likely recording some sort of usage metric, that perhaps they would share:


In 2015, Milestone 7 required practices to use at least three patient decision aids (PDAs) to support shared decision making in preference-sensitive care. Practices were also required to track use of the decision aids using one of the following methods: a metric tracking the proportion of patients eligible for the decision aid who receive the aid, or quarterly counts of patients receiving individual aids.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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