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Reviewer's report:

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. 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.

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.

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/i1949-8357-4-541.pdf

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.

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".

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