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**Reviewer's report:**

This paper reports how theory based approach to designing interventions to change the behaviour of health care practitioners. The examples cited relate to the procedures of placing nasogastric tubes. This is to my knowledge one of the only papers that reports the use of the Theoretical Domains Framework from the assessment of barriers and levers to implementation to the implementation of theoretically informed pragmatic strategies to address these.

I see that I have been asked to re-review this paper and I note from the covering letter that previous reviewers comments have been addressed.

The question posed is novel and highly relevant. The authors identify key publications that support their six step approach in the background section. The methods demonstrate a substantial and thorough piece of research. The time trend audit demonstrates positive shifts in behaviour in one trust (use of pH rather than x-ray) following interventions. Of particular interest (as a healthcare practitioner) is that these changes were considered by the trust as clinically significant. I was interested to see interview results as to the perceived strengths, weaknesses and sustainability of such an approach. The discussion is well balanced and supported by the data included.

I have no compulsory revisions to suggest to the authors. However, I request they check for a possible typographical error on table 3 – is the mean of all hospitals really 4.42 with regard to motivation and goals. This does not seem to fit with numbers for individual hospitals. Also, to be left to the authors discretion, I would have found it useful to know the range of the IPSBQ (I found the paper referenced and find it is 1 to 5). The authors say that barrier scores were low (they were between 2 and 3 in most or all cases). I would have found it useful to know whether 3 on the IPSBQ was considered a neutral value (as the options were strongly agree to strongly disagree). Does this potentially mean that there were no perceived barriers to practice?

Thank you very much for asking me to review this paper. I have thoroughly enjoyed reading it and I commend the authors on this relevant, interesting study that is so well presented.

**Level of interest:** An article of outstanding merit and interest 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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