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Reviewer's report:

The article is much improved and the authors are to be congratulated for being so responsive to the challenging issues raised during the review process. The article now seems to more accurately reflect (i) the actual design of the study, (ii) clarifies the methods undertaken, in particular clarifies the analytic approach, (iii) clarifies for the most part the presentation of results and what they represent, and (iv) provides good contextual information for this emerging approach of multiple case studies (the explanation at the end of the way this particular case fits with the multiple case study design is particularly useful (around line 622)).

Discretionary revisions

A few minor points, which will further clarify the methods and results, might be considered.

1. In the abstract the authors talk about undertaking a series of case studies. However, this paper concerns a single case. I think this should be clearer, that is, that this paper is a single case amongst a series that is to be undertaken in the future. To claim that this paper is presenting results about the series is misleading.

2. The results section, both the text and modified figures, is much improved and is very strong now. The first sentence of the Results may be misleading, the authors say, "In this section, we describe the relationship between contextual factors, outcomes and mechanisms at different levels.". Yet, in their response to reviewers they helpfully clarified that what is in the results section. Specifically, the authors note:

   We think that in the Results section we have to be broader and not limited to presenting the mechanisms, since the information provided here gives the reader the possibility to assess whether what we present as PT2 makes sense. However, we have modified the text to make more explicit what we consider that are mechanisms triggered by the interventions and contextual factors.

   As such the first sentence of the Results might state more accurately that what is being presented are both mechanisms but also important background information that was uncovered in the data collection and analysis process.

3. Because this is an emerging method, and readers may be less familiar with
the approach of explanatory case study (versus descriptive) the authors may want to note on page 10 around line 224 that collection of multiple sources of data is in fact a requirement and a strength of the approach allowing one to triangulate across data sources.
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