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Reviewer’s report:

This article is very clearly written and it is about an important topic. The readiness with which policies are constructed but then weakly implemented is a recurring problem for service transformation. The gap analysis and interpretation of the resistance to adoption of evidence is made clear in the article. My reservation is mainly methodological. The sample is declared in both the abstract and the method section but the reader is told little about its selection. Was it opportunistic, purposive or, in some sense to be defined, representative? For example, we are told that the focus groups were 'constituted' by different parties but how was that constitution arrived at? To be clear here. it may well be that because of methodological pragmatism, the sample used was as good enough and adequate to warrant the analysis and conclusions in the article. I just want to see the 'working out' involved in the sampling. Other than this point, there are many useful points of exploration and conclusion in this article.

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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