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Where the rubber meets the road: using FRAM to align work-as-imagined with work-as-done when implementing clinical guidelines. Robyn Clay-Williams, Jeanette Hounsgaard and Erik Hollnagel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Editor's Comments</th>
<th>Authors’ Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please send the two reviews back to the authors, asking them to respond to the Minor Essential Revisions identified by Dr. Costa, and addressing the concern that both reviewers have in terms of clarifying the relationship between the authors and the FRAM software. In their original cover letter, the authors declared that they had no conflict of interest in the research being reported. If, in fact, they are developers of the software, and if it is proprietary and for purchase, we would not be able to take this manuscript any further. Their relationship with the software development and any ownership needs to be disclosed. We would be grateful if you could address the comments in a revised manuscript and provide a cover letter giving a point-by-point response to the concerns.</td>
<td>Thank you for considering our revised manuscript. We have addressed each of the reviewers’ concerns as detailed below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reviewer 1 Comments**

Thank you for the opportunity to review this revised manuscript on FRAM analysis and guideline development in the ICU. This study by Clay-Williams and colleagues is an innovative and interesting study that can be quite useful to understand and improve implementation of guidelines. The authors addressed the major concerns I had in the first submission however it is unfortunate that the edits are not highlighted in the text (either by page number/line number or red text). It was difficult to discern what the exact changes were. Nonetheless, the description and application of FRAM is greatly improved in this revision and much clearer, particularly Table 1 & 2.

Thank you for your support of our study, and for your useful suggestions, which have encouraged us to strengthen our paper.
## Minor essential revisions:

1. The description in the text of Figure 1 & 2 is much improved however; adding legends to Fig 1 & 2 would be helpful. Being able to read the Figures stand-alone would be ideal and without a legend, that is challenging to do.

   | Labels have been added to Fig 1, and legends have been added to Figs 2 and 3, to enable them to be read as stand-alone illustrations. |

2. I do see that the results and discussion sections were separated but I think there is a lingering paragraph in the methods section that needs a header – the last paragraph in the Methods section starting with “Superficially, both procedures were well written….”. This appears to be referring to both of the cases and the overall process of FRAM but without a sub-heading, it seems to be only referring to Case #2.

   | We have added a new sub-heading as suggested. |

### Discretionary Revisions

3. For Case 2, first sentence in Results section describes that one researcher developed the initial FRAM. Is this common or best practice in FRAM? I understand that this FRAM was modified after team meetings with the clinicians but I suspect that fewer changes may have been needed if clinicians or other individuals were involved in the initial FRAM. If this is best or common practice, please indicate that in the manuscript.

   | It is indeed best if a team is involved in building the FRAM, but as in our case, an individual can also build the initial FRAM. We have added a few words to the manuscript to clarify. |

## Reviewer 2 Comments

The authors have largely addressed my concerns by reframing their presentation as an introduction and exploration of FRAM. I now find the presentation much easier to follow.

Authors’ Response

Thank you.

MAJOR COMPULSORY: if the authors have a relationship with the folks that produce the FRAM software, that should be disclosed

Authors’ Response

Although one of the co-authors (EH) worked closely with the software developer in developing the FMV, we do not believe there is a conflict of interest in this case, as there is no commercial gain involved. A signed letter from EH to the editor has been provided as follows, and this information has been...
The software tool named the FRAM Model Visualiser (FMV) encapsulates the principles of the Functional Analysis Resonance method (FRAM) and has been developed as a public service to support the practical use of the method. The FMV (currently Version 0.3.2) is provided free of charge and must not be sold for commercial purposes in either the original or a repackaged form. The software as well as the necessary documentation for its use can be downloaded from www.functionalresonance.com.