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Reviewer’s report:

This is a really well written manuscript. That are not many well written and well reported sequential mixed methods studies investigating implementation fidelity out there. The manuscript presented here might be such an example!

Reporting of such a study is challenging as one needs to find a good balance between what is going to reported here and what will be reported in other sources. This is also my main concern. I would like to have some additional Information about the study findings. It is not clear to me whether this will be the only publication from the project. There could also be more publications, e.g. conventional reporting of the RCT or the qualitative studies where Readers might be interested in more detailed information that are not included in this manuscript.

You are referring to the study protocol. However, this seems to focus on the conventional RCT (?!), while not many details are given on many issues mentioned here in this manuscript. So it would be good to know whether all methods were planned a priori and whether any deviations occured.

please include the Group numbers in table 4 and 7

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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