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General

This is a clinically relevant paper that simply explains the theoretical model and its practical application to two complex health care interventions. It is easy to read, the model is very comprehensive and it highlights important factors for evaluation.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

None.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

1. Page 2 reword 'clinically effectiveness' to 'clinical effectiveness'
2. Page 6 words missing?
Second paragraph: Contextual integration: This (refers) to the ...
Third paragraph, 4th last line: "...and the predicting their outcomes."
3. Page 6, 4th paragraph - should NPT be NPM?
4. Page 8, words missing?
2nd paragraph: "...PST is a based on the...
3rd paragraph, 4th line "...as part (of) a package of...
5. Page 14, 3rd paragraph, 7th line: "...techniques represented in this study are..." - should this be 'this paper'?

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

1. Page 7, 3rd paragraph: "...how to identify good proxies for the model's construct". Word 'proxies' is unclear.
2. Page 8, 4th paragraph wording unclear - "Our point of departure in comparing..."

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An exceptional article

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests.