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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this nicely written paper reporting findings from a well constructed study. The authors may wish to consider the following brief comments:

1. Page 9, line 193. It would be helpful at this point to provide examples of the type of clinical participants e.g nurse etc.

2. How did you seek/sample 'extreme case examples of clinical staff ...' (page 10, line 206)?

3. I found the tables a more helpful overview of the findings than the text. This may relate to the density of the descriptions under each of the domains. I did wonder if placing the selected quotes in the text would bring the voice of participants to this section.

4. This reader found that reference to decision aids, the intervention (including training), tools, and video and prompt cards were used so frequently and interchangeably that left this reader slightly confused at points - see first sentence of the discussion on page 20, line 431-2.

5. Is it possible to elaborate on context specific facilitators? Context is an important factor in implementation of complex interventions and interpretation of the findings.

6. Interesting point that lack of suitability of the intervention for patients was not a factor that emerged in the study. Does this reflect the patient profile of the practices? People with low literacy in their community language and/or limited health literacy will likely find prompt cards very difficult to engage with. It would be important to discuss this in relation to shared decision making given the diversity of the USA population and that of other high income countries.
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