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Reviewer's report:

This is a mixed methods study assessing barriers and facilitators to the use of decision boxes by clinicians at family practices in Canada. It is an important topic with relevance to the readership of this journal. I have the following suggestions.

Major essential revisions:

1. It would be useful to really clarify the purpose of the decision boxes in the introduction. At the moment, it suggests that they are designed to be a 'teaching tool' for clinicians which can be used at the point of care, rather than attending educational meetings. If this is the case, then there should be a bit more in the introduction from the continuing education literature. For example, there has been some promising work showing that 'spaced education' can be useful 'on-the-go' learning for clinicians.

2. Following on from the first point, the outcome measures are not really educational ones, they are focussing on use in clinical encounters. A better alignment between the purpose of the tool and the outcomes measures would be helpful. Perhaps the decision boxes are designed to achieve both purposes - use with patients AND education? If so, this could be much clearer and more consistent throughout the paper.

3. The quantitative results could be more concisely and succinctly presented by not duplicating what is in the Tables. There are a lot of tables and figures, some of which are also repetitive. I would focus the results on tables 5 & 6.

4. Table 2, could be removed and these results mentioned in the text.

5. It might be better to combine Tables 3 & 4 as your study population. In Table 4 you mention Interviews but in the article it says you conducted focus groups.

6. Table 5 is very difficult to understand. Can you put these into two columns and label the results on the right hand side which are currently ?mechanisms for change???

7. Table 7 could be absorbed into the text of the article and Figure 1 seems to duplicate this as well and could perhaps be removed.

8. The qualitative results are quite lengthy and would be easier for the reader if the main issues were summarised and then an example provided as a quote (perhaps some of the quotes form the supplementary file could be included).

9. Figure 1 - it is not clear what the letters mean at the top of each column in the
chart.

10. It would be helpful to provide a copy of a xbox so that readers can see what the intervention was.
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