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Reviewer's report:

Major Essential Revisions

1. I think the background needs some re-structuring. It would be useful to have a paragraph at the end of the background section that summarises the background and clearly articulates the problem that this review will address. This summary and the review questions appear before the description of Normalization process theory so may be a simple job of re-structuring.

2. Given that this is a qualitative review I would like to see a sentence or two that positions the authors in relation to the review. This is particularly important given they were involved with development of the theory. The authors are not neutral and need to acknowledge this.

3. In the method, critical appraisal, there is discussion of the issue of ethics and reporting, but no discussion about bias. It seems important to include that as well.

4. The authors clearly state that this review is qualitative yet the findings are presented in a very quantitative way reporting the number of papers. I would like to see the findings, particularly for pat (iii) presented in a more interpreted thematic way that demonstrates synthesis of the papers. For example, the last paragraph states "Four papers also made reference to the further development..." could be written "Suggestions for further development of NPT included ..."

5. Additional file 2 PICO table

In the description of study design I would expect to see qualitative designs named such as case study, qualitative descriptive. Interviews are the data collection approach not the study design. Perhaps the heading needs to be changed.

Minor Essential revisions

1. Abstract

How many databases instead of several.

2. Please refer to comments and track changes on the attachment.

3. Discussion

Consider why the comparison is made to Helfrich's finding about another framework. I am not clear what this adds to the discussion.
In relation to the point about providing a rationale for the choice of NPT in paragraph 6, can you offer a recommendation?

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**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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