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Author’s response to reviews:

REVIEWER

Thank you for your response. I still feel like your responses were a bit cursory. The inclusion of both cardiac and orthopedic devices may just be a weakness of the chosen methods. In an attempt to provide a broad understanding of medical devices, the manuscript lacks the ability to provide a nuanced understanding. It would still be nice to see a list of devices or procedures that the respondents mentioned during the interviews. I doubt they just called them "devices" but rather mentioned devices like "hip replacements" or "defibrillators". It would be helpful to see the range of devices submitted to help get passed the lack of nuance among devices. For me, this is analogous to asking doctors how they feel about medicines or how they feel about surgery. There is just so much variability among different medicines or surgeries. The consequence is that the themes of manuscript don't really feel like they apply to anything.
RESPONSE:

We re-examined data extracted from each of the 22 transcripts to create a list of devices and procedures. This may not be complete, as we did not specifically probe for that during interviews but, as the reviewer noted, this will provide readers with a sense of the range of devices to which participant comments pertain.

We added the following to Results, Participants and devices, page 8, line 18-22:

Cardiovascular devices mentioned by participants included accessories (screws, leads), artificial hearts, cannulae, implantable cardiac defibrillators, pacemakers, stents and values (tissue, mechanical). Orthopedic devices mentioned by participants included accessories (nails, screws, aiming devices), elbow prostheses, hip prostheses (hemi, total), locking plates, knee prostheses (unicompartmental, total), resurfacing caps or cups (hip, knee) and rods (femur, spine).

Discussion, page 13, line 15:

Physicians who use a range of implantable cardiovascular and orthopedic devices…

Conclusions, page 17, line 14:

This study explored factors that influence decision-making for treating patients with a range of implantable devices.

Abstract, Results, page 2, line 18:

Five major categories of themes emerged that all influence decision-making about a range of devices…