Article details: 2013-0040	
Title	Guideline harmonization and implementation plan for the BETTER trial: Building on Existing Tools to Improve Chronic Disease Prevention and Screening in Family Practice
Authors	Denise Campbell-Scherer MD PhD, Jess Rogers BA, Donna Manca MD MClSc, Kelly Lang-Robertson BA MLIS, Stephanie Bell BA Msc, Ginetta Salvalaggio MSc MD, Michelle Greiver MSc MD, Christina Korownyk MD, Doug Klein MSc MD, June C. Carroll MD, Mel Kahan MD MHSc, Jamie Meuser MD, Sandy Buchman MD, Rebekah M. Barrett RN BScN, Eva Grunfeld MD DPhil
Reviewer 1	Geoff Wong
Institution	UCL, Primary Care and Population Health, Royal Free Campus, London, United Kingdom
General comments	General comments: I enjoyed reading this manuscript as it does appear to me to cover an important point about guidelines in clinical practice - too many, each too focused on one disease and not necessarily actionable. As such the goal of the researchers in this project seems a most admirable one - to meld them into something manageable for the 'coal-face' family physician. Overall the level of detail provided enabled me to make sense of what was done and why. As such the manuscript is interesting and worthy of publication. Specific comments that needs attention: 1) I found that it took me some time to work out what the authors were up to and why in this manuscript. I wonder if this may be because the authors are trying to do too much? In essence this manuscript is about the process of producing the melded CPGs for the BETTER project. It may thus be worth only focusing on describing and justifying this process in THIS manuscript - leaving out any mention of the BETTER project unless it helps to inform what was done in this manuscript. This may then make it a bit clearer as to what this manuscript is about? If background information is needed about the BETTER project, then maybe it could be provided as a box or an appendix? 2) In the Interpretation section of the manuscript, the authors make comments about the data they find, but I noticed that there was not anything on the strengths and weaknesses of their process of producing these melded guidelines. This is not a criticism of what the authors of done, but more a question of whether there are any issues that the authors need to guard against. For example, some might say that their process, though transparent requires judgments (such as on what is or is not actionable) and so introduces its own 'biases'? There is no such thing as a perfect study/process, but identifying where 'controversy' might occur may at least acknowledge the challenges of the melding process and possibly help others who might wish to do something similar in the future.
Author response	**Reviewer 1's comments:** 1. I found that it took me some time to work out what the authors were up to and why in this manuscript. I wonder if this may be because the authors are trying to do too much? In essence this manuscript is about the process of producing the melded CPGs for the BETTER project. It may thus be worth only focusing on describing and justifying this process in THIS manuscript - leaving out any mention of the BETTER project unless it helps to inform what was done in this manuscript. This may then make it a bit clearer as to what this manuscript is about? If background information is needed about the BETTER project, then maybe it could be provided as a box or an appendix? *RESPONSE: Thank you for the helpful feedback. We have focused the mention of the BETTER trial to one paragraph in the introduction, so that the reader understands that we were undertaking this exercise in order to inform our intervention in a rigorous way. We are drafting another manuscript to deal with the BETTER intervention itself.* 2. In the Interpretation section of the manuscript, the authors make comments about the data they find, but I noticed that there was not anything on the strengths and weaknesses of their process of producing these melded guidelines. This is not a criticism of what the authors of done, but more a question of whether there are any issues that the authors need to guard against. For example, some might say that their process, though transparent, requires judgments (such as on what is or is not actionable) and so introduces its own 'biases'? There is no such thing as a perfect study/process, but identifying where 'controversy' might occur may at least acknowledge the challenges of the melding process and possibly help others who might wish to do something similar in the future. *RESPONSE: This was very helpful feedback. We have extensively re-worked the limitation section to try to address these excellent comments.*