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1. **Is the question posed by the authors well defined?**
The question is well defined but analysis is disaggregated to fit three separate papers. I recommend that these be published in one journal for the reader to get a comprehensive picture of the overall study.

2. **Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
Use of mixed methods adds value to what is available in the literature and is appropriate for integrative interpretation of results.

3. **Are the data sound?**
It is unclear how themes generated from qualitative data have been incorporated to understand the underlying dynamics evident from descriptive statistics. The essence of using mixed methods is to complement qualitative with quantitative findings. The authors are attempting to publish three papers with distinct data sources – qualitative, qualitative and then mixed methods. The papers should be published in one journal for value addition otherwise the original intention to use mixed methods is lost.

4. **Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?**
The standards have been respected by the authors.

5. **Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?**
One conclusion 'Apparently easier short term solutions such as dissemination of CPGs, in-service training, and reinforcement activities will likely have limited success without this more fundamental change.' assumes that the factors identified in the manuscript have been classified as short-, medium- and long-term. This does not appear to be the case. Additionally, the conclusion on the importance of organizational framework to promote professionalism and its implications for hospital leadership is not well articulated in the discussion. The authors should be specific and highlight examples of these challenges – what is
offered is rather general – including the factor that hospital leadership is at various levels. What did the authors mean? This firm conclusion also seems to contradict the fact that authors acknowledge the multiplicity and complexity of adoptive systems.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
For a fuller understanding of the institutional factors and their implications on hospital leadership – a stakeholder analysis detailing positions and locus of power would have greatly enhanced the interpretation and recommendations in the short-, medium- and long-term.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes,

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
This is adequate.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
The writing is well done and therefore acceptable.

**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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