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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript is a very well written report of a qualitative arm of a 2X2 factorial cluster RCT that compared outcomes of two evidence-based shared decision making (SDM) interventions for contraception method selection. 16 clinics participated in the RCT with 4 clinics serving as controls, 4 getting both interventions 4 getting one intervention and 4 getting the other intervention. Results of the quantitative outcomes of the study are published elsewhere. This study focused on qualitative interviews with clinicians and administrative staff from the 12 intervention clinics specifically aiming to learn about factors that influenced the implementation and sustainability of the two interventions. The Theoretical Domains Framework was used to guide the interviews and analyze the data. Overall, the design and methods for the study were sound. Three investigators participated in the analysis of the data to ensure reliability of findings and interpretations. In general the findings are fairly consistent with the findings of multiple other studies regarding the barriers and facilitators for implementation and sustainability of a practice change. What is new here is applying SDM interventions for guiding contraception discussions and choices between clinicians and patients. Thus, the readership may be interested in the implications regarding adopting evidence-based shared decision making practices. There were a lot of themes identified that were distilled down to key findings that, again, are consistent with other studies. I have no issues that need addressing; the manuscript findings are not overly novel but meaningful and theory driven.
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