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Dear Professor Goldsmith,

MS: 5505746621599387 - Intervention description is not enough: evidence from an in-depth multiple case-study on the untold role and impact of context in RCTs of 7 Complex Interventions.

Thank you for your reviewer’s report and for providing a detailed list of revisions to the version of this paper we submitted on 9th May 2012. Please find attached our revised manuscript.

We have addressed all the comments in your report dated today and have highlighted these in red. All corrections have been made as indicated below:

1. P(age) 4, paragraph 2, line 1. [RCTS] has been replaced by [RCTs].

2. P 9, paragraph 1, line 6. [in order] has been removed.

3. P 11, paragraph 5, line 2. The inconsistent use of the number of dots has been addressed, also in the following places: - P 12, paragraph 1, lines 1 and 2. Also P 12, paragraph 5, line 1. Also P 13, paragraph 1, line 4. Also P 13, paragraph 4, line 3. Also P 14, paragraph 4, line 4. Also P 15, paragraph 2, lines 1 and 2. Also P 13, paragraph 1, line 1.

4. P 17, paragraph 1, line 5. The closing bracket intended to be after [groups)] has been added.

5. P 28, Interviews first line. An [s] has been added to [nurse] to read [nurses].

6. P 36, reference 1, paragraph 2. The City and Country have been added.

7. P 36, reference 16, line 2. Why the different use of quotes ['] and ['"]? Should they not be the same? Yes, we agree, although the printed version of the article is as written in our previous version. We have changed it in this version to [']

8. P 37, reference 24 Authors for the Schulz et al paper have been amended to [JJ] for the 3rd author, [DG] for the 4th author, [Tunis S] for the 5th author. However, the original paper writes CONSORT and Pragmatic….as is written in our reference. On line 3, [a2390.] has been inserted after [337].

9. P 37 and 38. Reference 25 and 41 were the same. Ref 41 has now been deleted and the numbering revised.

10. P 37, paragraph 29, line 3. [Dundee, Scotland.] has been added?

11. P 38, paragraph 44, line 1 now reads [Czaja SJ, Schulz R, Lee CC, Belle SH, REACH Investigators:]. On line 3 [:385-395.] after [18] has been added.

12. P 38, paragraph 49, line 3. The location for this reference has been given.

13. P 39 and 40, paragraph 53, 56 and 75. All named authors have been listed in these references.

14. P 39, paragraph 62, line 1 now reads [Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D, CONSORT]
Group:

15. P 40, R 70 and 76 were the same. Ref 76 has been removed and the numbering system updated.
16. P 40, R 77, I 2. The [.] after [?] has been deleted.

We have checked that our manuscript complies with all guidelines and believe that it is much improved as a result of the revisions made. We very much hope that Trials will agree to publish our paper and we look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

M.W.

Dr Mary Wells and Prof Brian Williams