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Reviewer's report:

I read this paper with great interest.

INTRODUCTION
The introduction seems on the light side. Can you add further evidence that this research is required? The authors only report on one study (10) line 90. Did the authors follow any guidelines on developing a decision support tool? If not, why not? The authors use a very old reference from 1980 (11) line 96 on decision support and there is a wealth of information on this area.

Ethics
Ethics was obtained in Toronto. How did this cover recruiting in the US?

METHOD
Further explanation is required as to why interviews were chosen instead of other methods for example, focus groups.

PARTICIPANT SELECTION
Line 140 mentions non-responders. How many participants were actually invited? Did any decline and if so, why? If many did, it would be interesting to know reasons why. Line 146 states between 20-30 participants is sufficient. Why was recruitment stopped at 24 interviews?

DATA COLLECTION
Were interview transcripts anonymised before being imported to NVIVO? More information is required to explain why you selected the TDF over other popular Frameworks. In addition, why did you select these specific TDF domains for consideration over other TDF domains? What was your rationale for this?

DATA ANALYSIS
It needs to be clearer what the authors are referring to as the interpretative descriptive approach (and Thematic Analysis). In the abstract it seems to incorporate the design and here it mentions coding. Further detail is required. Line 180 Please outline the feedback and how this shaped the manuscript.
RESULTS
Line 183-194 should be under a participant title and not in the results section.
Tables 2 and 3 were hard to match with the text. I presume the authors have included the quotes in the tables for word limit. The tables need to also show the factor numbers to easily link to the text.
Line 219 'Some of their' typo on their.
A table would be useful to show the overview of the categories and related factors. Coming to the section 'other categories and factors became confusing in comparison to the other detailed categories.

DISCUSSION
It's not clear how this research will be used. Further information on future directions is required.

Other comments
It would be useful to include a description next to the names of the Theories, Models, and Frameworks in Table 4.

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

No

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

No

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

No

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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