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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer 1:

1. Although the authors have significantly improved the manuscript, I still have some concerns with the generalizability and intent of the study. The authors need to complete a more thorough literature review in order to provide more meaning and context to their study, in addition to making their research aim more clear.

Author’s Response: Thank you for this comment. We reviewed additional literature and selected a review paper from the public health field to provide more meaning and context to this study.

Page 5, lines 11-14

2. This paper continues to mix-up the aim of the study or the authors need to tighten up the research aim and the language used throughout the manuscript. This study did not illustrate or evaluate the reach of TNP into rural communities, the findings indicate that what was in fact studied were stakeholder/user perceptions ABOUT a GIS tool that illustrates the reach of TNP into rural communities.

Author's Response: Thank you for helping us refine our study aim. We have updated the aim throughout the manuscript.
3. The background section references a study of troop movements and an increased risk of ALS, this is not entirely relevant to the study presented. Other studies have been published on the use of maps for program decision making. Please look into human factors and usability research studies since this is ultimately a usability study of GIS. These studies are often not indexed in PubMed, but are closely related to the study presented.

Author's Response: Thank you for this comment. We reviewed the human factors and usability literature. The majority of published papers did not pertain to our topic, but we did identify a review article from the public health field which fit nicely. We have added this to the background section.

Page 5, lines 11-20

4. Consider a different summary statistic to present the results of the acceptability and appropriateness measures. Means are often of limited value for likert scales-
https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3886444/pdf/i1949-8357-5-4-541.pdf

Author's Response: Thank you for identifying our error. We reviewed the article you shared and have changed the summary statistic to medians. This is also recommended by Weiner et al for the Acceptability and Appropriateness of Interventions Measures.

Page 11, line 3-4

Page 20, Table 1

5. The terms "advertising" and "sell" are still used throughout the paper and seem inappropriate for the VA setting. Perhaps consider using "advocacy" instead for those sentences that do not include a quote.

Author's Response: We appreciate this recommendation and have changed “advertising” and “sell” to more appropriate language for the VA.

Page 9, line 12 (communicate)
Page 10, line 4 (communicating)
Page 10, line 22 (promote and advocate).

There was one direct quote where advertise was used. We kept that sentence intact.
6. For the first sentence of the discussion- this does not describe what the study accomplished. Consider rephrasing to "This study aimed to evaluate stakeholder perceptions of GIS as a communication tool for illustrating the reach of TNP into rural communities".

Author's Response: Thank you for this suggested edit. We have changed the study aims to this wording through the manuscript.


7. For the conclusion, there is no evidence to support the statement that the maps enhanced feedback efforts.

Author's Response: Thank you for this critical comment. We have removed this from our conclusion paragraph.

Page 12, line 20

Editor's Comments:

1. In particular, please note if you choose to resubmit that the revisions were not highlighted in your first revision, so it was not possible to see what changes had been made. Please highlight changes in the next revision.

Author's Response: Thank you. I apologize that these revisions were not displayed on earlier submission. I believe this must have been a computer glitch on my part for my co-authors approved a version that was highlighted. I have double checked that the version uploaded has changes highlighted in red and with track changes.

2. We ask that you pay particular attention to the reviewer comments about study aims, which need some streamlining. At times it is mentioned (including in the abstract) that the purpose was to assess program impact, or that the maps help understand how the program is serving those at risk which is not the case as stated at other times (the maps cannot tell anything about the quality of services provided but it is possible to assess the maps' usefulness, which we understand is your intent).

Author's Response: Thank you for this comment. We have made the suggested edits regarding the study aim to the abstract, introduction, and discussion.
3. Please also provide more detail on your method of "content analysis."

Author's Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We added more detail regarding the categorization matrix we used for content analysis in the methods section.

Page 7-8, lines 22-3

4. Please do not use quotes in the abstract.

Author's Response: Thank you for this comment. We have deleted the quotes from the abstract.

Page 3, line 1-2 [deleted]

5. Finally, please review the article for terms that may need further clarification (e.g., "TNP stakeholders").

Author's Response: Thank you, we defined site champions and eliminated the use of “stakeholders”, instead referring to them as transitions nurses, site champions, leadership or sites throughout the paper.

Page 2, lines 13, 18, 20, 23

Page 3, line 1, 6

Page 4, line 23

Page 5, line 5, 6, 14, 16, 17, 26

Page 6, line 5, 12, 13

Page 9, line 10, 16

Page 10, lines 3, 4, 7, 14, 19, 21

Page 11, lines 2, 5, 14, 20, 26

Page 12, lines 2, 10, 21