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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Data Collection Procedures, first sentence: there needs to be a statement that the interview questions addressed the following components of the model, with a brief description of each of the components. Information about the number of questions and the Likert scale should follow that because in and of itself, it does not provide the specific information the reader needs to understand the data that was collected. It would also be helpful to say that the first set of questions collected quantitative data.

2. Qualitative Data coding, etc.

2.a. Second paragraph [that begins with ‘Constructs depicted in Figure 1]

This paragraph is too long. It is hard for this reader, with strong background in qualitative data collection and analysis, to follow and to be sure I understand the procedures that were followed.

2.b. Also, unless Figure 1 and Table 2 will appear in the text near this section of the paper, I think it is not appropriate to expect that readers will want to flip back and forth between this section and the figure and the table. It would be better to say something like 'these constructs, . . . . provided the organizing framework' and so on. Then it makes sense to reference Figure 1 and Table 2 and those will be helpful to a reader who wants more information.

2.c. It is not clear to me if coding was a 2-step process or if the first four sentences of this paragraph serves as a summary of the coding process, with details following.

2.d. Were codes available to coders or developed de novo?

2.e. A general question: If the interviews followed the a priori constructs (from Figure 1 and Table 2, I assume), what was the purpose of the coding? To refine the constructs? To verify them? To determine their applicability at each facility? To validate the model? If the latter, that wasn’t stated as the purpose of conducting the interviews.

3. Results: Implementation Effectiveness
First paragraph [which is also too long and could be divided into two paragraphs]: it is not clear how the 'ratings' shown in Table 3 were arrived at or what the ratings were based on.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. In Qualitative Dating Coding section, second paragraph, the sentence that begins with 'The pairs of analysts . . .' It is not clear what 'rotated' means; I think a more precise word and/or description is required. I don't think 'groupthink' is a good analytic term; I suggest deleting it and revising the definition [that was included in parentheses] and using it since it more clearly describes the purpose behind creating different pairs of analysts on a weekly basis.

2. The sentence that follows footnote [25]: 'Each pair of analysts . . . its summaries' [not 'their' since the referent is pair, not analysts.]

3. Second to last sentence, that begins with 'The implementation researchers. . .' needs to be tightened because it raises an important issue in qualitative research: the role of an investigator as analyst. Most quantitative researchers will think this situation screams 'bias,' and while it could, the authors correctly emphasize that familiarity with the data can [and, I would argue, should] contribute to more subtle analysis using qualitative data. However, this needs to be more carefully stated and the ways in which triangulation was used for validating data and ensuring reliability in data analyses and limiting bias needs clarification. A reference to a good qualitative research theory and methods book would be helpful here.

Discretionary Revisions

1. In the Abstract, Methods paragraph, third sentence: add the word 'candidate' in front of Veterans to accurately describe the selection criteria for facilities. I took this word from Table 3. Without this word, the implication is that facilities were chosen based on participation rates for all Veterans.

2. In the Implementation Framework section, second paragraph, fourth sentence, add the word 'candidate' for the same reasons given in comment 1. above.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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