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Reviewer's report:

Thank you very much for the opportunity to review this study, which provides an interesting perspective on the implementation of CDS from the perspective of the CFIR. I think the study is of interest to the readership, however I would like to make the following suggestions to ensure it meets the required standards for publication in this journal. I’m looking forward to seeing a revised copy of the manuscript in future.

Abstract

* Please mention that your key informants were drawn from both leadership and direct provision clinician groups.

Background

* You observe that positive impacts from patient outcomes are recorded if the systems were developed by the study authors - could this be influenced by positive publication bias?

* Final sentence - do you mean that CDS also focus on tobacco cessation and obesity management?

Methods

* This is the section that I believe requires the most work, as it currently doesn't have sufficient information to describe your method in appropriate detail

* Please provide a rationale for seeking the perspective of leaders - will they be using the system day to day? Also, how do you define 'leadership'?

* How long prior to implementation did you do these interviews? Had they had a chance to trial it, or is it based solely on previous experience of other systems?
* The workflow print offs could be provided as a supplementary file for the readers further information

* International readers won't be familiar with the term 'rooming staff' - this needs to be defined and differentiated from PCPs. Also, why did you combine these two groups in terms of your analysis?

* How did you select the parts of the CFIR you chose to focus on? You're identified all five domains, but I'm assuming you didn't address every single construct within them. The framework is mentioned just in this section, but ideally its terms and concepts should be embedded throughout the paper.

* The waiver of documentation of informed consent seems unusual given this research was being completed on human subjects. Please provide more information regarding this decision and how it relates to national research ethics guidelines.

* Your description of method is a little confused - you say you used open coding adapted from grounded theory, but this is clearly a content analysis. How did you adapt these techniques from grounded theory to make them appropriate to content analysis?

* How much did the coding by MH and AT differ prior to consensus being achieved?

Results

* Please include a statement of the total sample before enumerating the characteristics of sub groups

* How does difficulty finding both outside records and in-house colonoscopy reports impact on the use of CDS - this seems to assume greater knowledge of your systems than the average reader is likely to have.

* Why do the workflows need to be in colour?

* Which other team members were recommended to go through the CDS printouts with patients - they then become users of the system too.

* Am amazed and disappointed that health professionals were expressing doubts about the efficacy of the HPV vaccine!!! Is the point you're making that people won't implement CDS if they doubt the validity of the information it provides - if so you need to make this stronger.

* It strikes me that many of the barriers and facilitators are flipsides of the same theme - this could perhaps be used to arrange your results more concisely, as they are slightly repetitive in their current format.
Discussion

* Some good links to existing literature, but I would like to see more discussion of the role of users in the design of CDS going forward. You've mentioned the guidelines / models and working with the design firm, but where were users in all this? Were they consulted directly? How much change could they influence given the system was well down the design track by the time this study occurred?

* Well done on describing the actions you are taking as a result of these findings ... this is great to see / hear along with your plans of further evaluation.

* Your limitations paragraph is far to brief. Please show a more critical response to the limitations of your study.

Conclusion

* Your conclusion may need to be reworded slightly after you've responded to the reviewer recommendations, particularly in regards to presentation of the results.
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