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Reviewer's report:

General
Thank you for asking me to review this paper. Whilst undertaking process evaluations nested within randomised trials of complex interventions is becoming established practice, these are often not fulfilling their potential in terms of yielding the data necessary to answer important questions beyond those of effectiveness and cost-effectiveness. This paper provides a persuasive case for using the normalisation process model (NPM) as a framework for undertaking such process evaluations. This paper follows on from Carl’s earlier BMC paper in which he proposed the NPM. This initial paper has excited considerable interest as no doubt will this successor. It is well written and highly readable, although I think people may struggle a bit to understand the NPM from its necessarily brief description here, if they haven’t read the earlier paper. However, I have absolutely no hesitation in recommending its publication.

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)
On page 6, last paragraph, the model is referred to twice as the NPT.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

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.
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