

## Reviewer's report

**Title:** Adoption and sustainability of decision support for patients facing health decisions: An implementation case study in nursing

**Version:** 1 **Date:** 21 June 2006

**Reviewer:** Berith Hedberg

### Reviewer's report:

General

-----  
Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. There is some obscurity concerning the number of informants concerning the information in the abstract and table 1. In the abstract the authors state that 11 nurses had used the decision support protocol and 22 intended to do it, i.e.  $11+22=33$ ! This information can be misleading because it is not clear how the four key informants is accounted for. How many informants participated in the study?

2. In a similar way, it is unclear about how the document review is included in the data collection as well as in the analysis. The information from the documents in the first part of the result is however valuable in understanding the result from the specific contextual concern.

-----  
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

-----  
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

1. Table 3 is informative but the understanding had been facilitated if the discussion had been structured from the content in the table instead of new headings.

**What next?:** Accept after minor essential revisions

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.