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Author’s response to reviews:

Thank you to the reviewer for the valuable feedback regarding our paper. Please find specific responses below.

- The referencing also needs to be re-done as the Vancouver style is required. Thank you for reminding the authors, it was an oversight that is now rectified.
- Consider moving your definition of ‘healthcare resign’ nearer to the start of the introduction, and avoiding the reference to ‘process redesign’ (Line 96) as this is another term. You also repeatedly use the phrase ‘clinical redesign’ - it would-be less confusing to stick to one term for the paper. Thank you the word process has now being changed to clinical to become consistent with the other term of clinical redesign.
- Line 139 - please clarify the phrase “under randomised controlled condition” - does this mean it was trialled first, prior to implementation? This sentence uses the phrase in the traditional meaning of the word scientific phrase. The redesign initiative was trialled at the time of implementation by randomisation in controlled conditions. The reader can go to the reference for description of the full protocol.
- Line 148 - Capital ’T’ start of Sentence ‘The” Completed, thank you.
- Line 153 - reword ‘internally or externally driven perspective” ?”can be internal or externally driven” Completed, thank you.
In this sentence “ritual” is referring to a human habit, something that may be affected by the redesign process or outcomes and should be considered in the project planning (mapping) phase. The reference provides more information about this topic and readers can source the article if they are interested for deeper understanding.

This sentence is explaining that the parameters around which stakeholders are actually fundholders and how the resources are distributed will require negotiation. The sentence is complete. Thank you.

Completed, thank you.

- Line 194 - consider rewording heading e.g. “Determining roles in redesign”
  Completed, thank you.

- Line 205 - which phase are you referring to?
  Thank you for highlighting the lack of clarity, we are referring to the planning phase. This has been rectified within the paper.

- Line 212 - do you mean ‘healthcare institutions’ rather than ‘healthcare staff’?
  Yes – thank you. This has been amended within the paper.

- Lines 251 - 254 - this sentence is very long and doesn’t make sense - please reword, preferably across two sentences
  Thank you, this sentence has been completed and the grammatical inconsistencies remediated.

- Line 262 - not sure how participation in the literature review enables the clinicians to choose their performance criteria?
  Thank you, the authors have clarified the sentence to make it clearer to the reader.

- Lines 286 and 288 - the year of the references is not specified - please fix
  Completed, thank you.

- Line 296 - remove additional full stop
  Completed, thank you.