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Reviewer's report:

1. This was an interesting paper which describes a QI programme for improvement in sustainable engagement with OATs. In general, it was a fairly coherent piece which provided an articulate overview of the context and findings although there were some content issues in both abstract and within the main body of the text.

2. The background information provided a useful contextual piece for the research. However, it should be presented as a discrete section rather than within the methodology section.

3. The aims and objectives of the evaluation should be clearly outlined prior to the methodology section. Is it a process evaluation? Is it simply a QI audit? What did you hope to measure and why? One sentence is not enough for the reader.

4. The conclusion is much too brief and does not represent the main points of learning from the 'evaluation/audit'. This requires a substantial revision.

5. The abstract refers to qualitative data and it is not entirely clear what this means. There is a presentation of some very basic descriptive data but it is not qualitative.

PG 7 Line 14 - Place the website address in the reference section.
It is not clear what the BOOST is until PG 5 line 128. Thus should be discussed alongside the BST at the beginning of the article to provide clarity from the outset.

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

Unable to assess

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

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

No

**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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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