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Reviewer’s report:

Strengths

This is an interesting and informative study that contributes not only to the science of implementation but also the practical aspects of enhancing audit and feedback interventions to promote practice change. This work is well designed and well executed.

I have no major concerns but a few minor issues that would benefit from some additional clarification.

1) In the abstract, it was not immediately apparent to me that this was not a primary results paper but rather a secondary or corollary analysis. I realize that the last sentence of the background describes the primary results but rather than just stating "...increased the intervention's effectiveness..." it would be helpful to state "...increased the intervention's effectiveness in improving the primary outcome of pain management performance...". Then, in the objective statement it might be clearer to say that the purpose or objective of this study was: "To understand how the action implementation toolbox facilitated action planning by ICUs to increase A&F effectiveness." or something along those lines. This seems more consistent with the framing provided in the second bullet of the contributions to the literature section, which is what helped clarify for me the purpose of this specific study.

2) In the introduction section, paragraph 2, please provide a definition of overall pain management performance as it would be helpful to have some context as to what the percentages might reflect.

3) In the results section and table 2 it was challenging to understand some of the measures and the differences between certain measures, thus the unique information being provided was not always clear. For example, total number of actions completed is reported in both the top and bottom sections of table 2 but neither is discussed. Also, the distinction between the median information and percentages, while noted in the footnote to table 2, would be helpful to include in the text as well.

4) In the discussion, one of the items noted as never selected by ICUs involved increasing nurses' autonomy to prescribe pain medication. While Dutch nurses may have a different scope of practice, only advanced practice nurses in the U.S. have any sort of prescribing authority. So, this type of practice change, as currently described, could not occur because it is outside the licensure
and scope of practice of nurses. As such, a more specific description of this recommended action as a potentially feasible strategy would be helpful.

Other issues

5) The phrasing of the first part of the title as a question is a bit confusing. This may be personal preference but a declarative statement (e.g., Facilitating action planning within audit and feedback interventions: A mixed-methods . . .) seems more appropriate.

6) In the analysis section, I suspect this is just a typo or language translation issue, lines 25-26 "understand which practice determinants ICUs had been targeted for change." does not make sense.
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