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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions: None

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Methods, Facility Selection, 1st sentence: facilities 'that' or 'which' rather than facilities 'who.'

2. Qualitative data coding, analysis & interpretation, 2nd paragraph: It's not correct to say that 'pairs of analysts were rotated,' because the description you provide describes the rotation of one member of each pair of analysts. Also, the description that follows could be condensed, if you wish, or summarized and you could refer to the analytic steps described previously [especially #2 and #3].

Discretionary Revisions

1. Background, 3rd paragraph, use specific references to dates or time periods rather than phrases such as 'to date' or 'in its fifth year' because without a referent, the information is too vague to be useful. Also, the sentence about eligibility for the MOVE! program doesn't really fit in the middle of the paragraph; it might fit better following the 2nd or third sentence. Or, leave it out altogether.

2. Methods, Implementation Framework

The use of 'implement' and 'implementation' in paragraph 4 isn't as clear as I would like it to be here, as well as in other places in the paper. Often, these words are used interchangeably in a sentence, as a verb and a noun or an adjective. So, I suggest that analytic terms or descriptive phrases be considered for 'implement,' such as 'to put in place,' or 'to carry out [specific] activities and/or processes' or 'to achieve' [something], for example. Otherwise, it's too easy to say something like 'we implemented the implementations.'

For #4, the clinical champion, the first sentence isn't a definition, so delete it. The second sentence is sufficient.

3. Methods, Outcome Measure, 1st paragraph: Since Table 1 contains the phrase 'treatment components' of the MOVE! program, I suggest using that phrase throughout the paper instead of 'core essential components' or 'key core components' [or any other variation].
4. Methods, Measures & Data Collection, 1st paragraph: see #3 above.

5. Methods, Measures & Data Collection, 4th paragraph: 'where appropriate' to refer to additional questions [at interviewer's discretion] doesn't provide much information to the reader. It would be more helpful if the statement were something like 'when we needed more information about processes or barriers or whatever, we asked follow-up questions to elicit more details.'

6. Methods, Measures, etc.: When describing coding [1st paragraph], it would be helpful to say that all 8 components of the theoretical model were coded, or whatever, just to help the reader keep track.

7. Qualitative data coding, analysis & interpretation, 2nd or 3rd paragraph: Since your unit of analysis is the facility, I would prefer to read that the analysts prepared one document per facility, with findings for each construct as well as a summary statement. Then you can describe the elements of the summary statement.

8. Results, Implementation Effectiveness, 1st paragraph: This is another instance in which implementation effectiveness is described in terms of 'implementation,' which doesn't really tell me much. However, having said that, you go on to present a lot of data/finds that describe activities that constituted implementation. So, you could either revise the previous sentence or even delete it or say something like 'implementation effectiveness' depends on achievement of these actions [or something like that]. Also, this paragraph needs the exclamation point after MOVE.

9. Results, Limitations of qualitative data: It is interesting to me that after the careful presentation of the procedures for collection, coding, analysis and interpretation of the qualitative data that the authors are so willing to think it might be biased, even when they stated in the Methods section that the qualitative data was collected in order to validate the quantitative data. The results of their analysis show that result and, further, their presentation of the qualitative data enhances the quantitative data. It seems to me that the authors should express confidence in their qualitative data. [I also think the sentence about 'groupthink' is unnecessary, given their data analysis procedures.]
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