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- Major Compulsory Revisions

Introduction - The purpose and breadth of the study is unclear. It seems from the introduction that the process evaluation will be used to inform the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of the CLIs being compared. Yet the study falls short of this aim. There is no impact or cost data presented in this study. The fact that the reader has no idea if the CLIs in question worked at all leads one to ask why are we looking at this if there is no difference in impact.

Another aspect that is unclear is the difference between implementation and execution of the CLIs.

How are these operationalized? At time they appear to be used interchangeably.

Data Collection (paragraph 1) - There are some inconsistencies in the description of the sample.

10 HCCs (5 start up and 5 supervised) are included. What does the n=27 refer to? It seems that there are 25 HCPs interviewed. In addition, the 10 HCCs were selected for interviews. What criteria/method was used for selection. With respect to participant questionnaires: How were these distributed and collected? Who was responsible? If these were implemented every 3 months, were only the 12 month questionnaires used in this study?

Does structured registration of communication refer to log-books? If so just say that, since in the abstract that is the data source referred to.

Fidelity (paragraph 1)- The contracts used from Re-Aim are defined but the key concepts from other frameworks are not listed or defined. Perhaps a table that lists each construct in the evaluated, defines it and lists the data sources, would help organize the paper.

Implementation - The measurement of implementation is weak. All based on perception and self-report of HCPs and participants. HCP attendance records were not used. There are no measures of quality or types of support.

Several previous studies about the Beweegkuur are cited. Some of the
necessary background details should be provided so that the reader understands the overall initiative. It is not clear why HCC had precious exposure to the supervised program and then changed their offering after randomization. This seems a problematic design flaw.

- Minor Essential Revisions

There are several issues with word choice and tense that should be addressed prior to publication.

The authors use “has been” versus “was.” If the study and program are completed and the program is in the past then “was” is more appropriate.

Introduction (paragraph 2), the sentence “studies often lack implementation in daily practice” is unclear in its meaning. Do the authors intend to say the interventions effective in controlled experimental trials have not been evaluated in real world settings?

Methods – Intervention and Settings (paragraph 2) This maybe regional but would it not be more clear to say “recruited and guided” rather than “included and guided”; I suggest using the word recruitment rather than inclusion.

The word “whilst” is not commonly used in the US. Other options, alternatively, while, or in comparison

Context (paragraph 2) “Continually” do you mean continuously?

Figures

The figure did not have titles on the axis. At least they did not translate well in my word processor. A legend should be included to differentiate between the two lines.

Statistical review

I have some concerns with the statistics selected. In particular in table 2 where the protocol indicates that PT group meetings are not included, yet people report that they receive them and the median I zero. It seems that these might be false positives. Here is where attendance records from HCPs would be better measures of dose rather than participant recall.

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests