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Reviewer's report:

This paper is a welcome addition to the literature and contributes new approaches which are well justified. In drawing together relevant theories from the sociology of the professions literature together with those of implementation theory the authors construct and illuminate the case study admirably. It is a very well written paper, which is coherent, fluent, articulate and polished. The methodology is clear and appropriate (drawing on a range of stakeholder views), the data is sound and well presented, and sustains the discussion and conclusions. Whilst greater emphasis might have been given to the explanatory force of the sociological theories - notably Abbott’s (1988) jurisdictional disputes and, of course, Larson’s (1977) seminal ‘professional project’ (which retains currency - see Macdonald 1995) - the paper does draw sufficiently from this base (Abbott 1988 and Freidson 1994 most evidently). Indeed, the paper is a novel and important contribution, carefully balanced and nuanced, and I would support its publication wholeheartedly. I have only a small number of minor essential revisions, which will require the authors to read through the manuscript again to search for each example of error - the tendency to have two words together, without a separation eg. “monitoringof” (Abstract, background section, line 4) should read “monitoring of”. Similarly this is evident in the abstract, results section, line 4, "GFUthat" should be "GFU that". There are several examples of this through the text - see main paper, para 1, line 4 "societal expectations", which should read "societal expectations". There are instances through the text - page 10, last para, "hospitaloptometrists" ; page 11, last para too - several in that paragraph.

Otherwise, the paper is sound, interesting, novel and original - I would congratulate the authors on a fine paper.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
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