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Reviewer's report:

This paper has improved substantially. Generally I am happy with how the authors have handled my previous comments. However, re-reading the paper, with the alterations made since previous review, I want to provide some additional thoughts/comments.

Through the revisions the relatively small sample size regarding patients has been more prominent. What are the implications of having only about 4 patients per trained nurse? This is not described as a limitation, isn’t it a limitation? I also wonder about your description in the abstract where you write that a total of 12 nurses participated in the study. I understand that you trained 12 nurses in the program, but that also other people participated in the study as informants. Why focusing on these 12 nurses?

In the background section you write that little is known from the literature about what factors are “really important” for facilitation/hindering implementation. Would be good to see in the discussion section how you judge your own findings. Did you find the “really important” determinants?

On page 6 (bottom lines) you have two sentences that in my opinion do not contribute to strengthening your overview of evidence for the lively legs intervention. “Effects on ulcer healing and pain were not conclusive, but were promising. In Germany, researchers recently developed a nurse-led educational intervention to enhance self care in patients with chronic ulcers [15]. Unfortunately no results have been reported yet.” I think you should take out these sentences.

On page 8 you state “Next to this, the evaluation makes use of more structured and quantitative methods”. As point 2 this is followed by that you used interviews with open ended questions. I think you should consider a more logical ordering.

On page 10 there is a reference number lacking on line 6.

On page 21 there seems to be a redundant “is” in the third line in the second paragraph.

In my previous comments I indicated that I did not get the range in the bottom of table 4. I still have problem with this table. For case 4 you sum up that 15 of 16 strategies were carried out and that the range was 4-14. How can it come that
the range does not include the number of strategies carried out?

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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