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Reviewer’s report:

Authors analyse and discuss the importance of combining different behavioural approaches to guide the study and the implementation of self-management tools in clinical practice, reporting the application of the method in DUK IP.

The conclusions that authors draw from the study are of particular interest in suggesting efficient approaches for the development of clinical supporting systems.

The paper is very well written and organized. My main comments are driven by interest of in-depth the translation of the results to implementation science, i.e. the development of novel decision support systems. On this regards I would suggest to expand this perspective, and to discuss how the proposed analysis might fit in the concept of "Learning Health System" (as described in "The forgetting health system" by Coiera, and applied in the T2D context in "A dashboard-based system for supporting diabetes care" by Dagliati).

Although the statistical analysis sounds and the interrater reliability results show a sufficient level of agreement, I wonder if authors took into consideration possible "practice effects", as it seems they've included in the analyses only one professional per centre.

Few minor comments regards the improvement of the "Habit and healthcare professional behaviour" chapter at page 5, where authors should give a more rigorous definition of "dual concept" in order to be consistent in the following text.

Figure 1 needs a caption that illustrates the concepts in details.

Define and provide a reference for Nvivo 7 (page 10).

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