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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for inviting me to re-review this paper. Unfortunately, after revision the main concerns I previously raised remain a concern in this revised version. As I noted in my previous review, this manuscript does not seem to document a research process as such. When assessed as a research output, the major methodological flaws and reporting issues previously flagged up still remain - e.g. there is no overall study design informing this piece of work; the rationale for the chosen methods of data collection (or indeed important details relating to their use, such as why were interviews not recorded and transcribed) remains undocumented; the sampling strategy remains unreported (only a brief mention to purposeful sampling for the chart review with no description of criteria and approach to this type of sampling, and no mention at all for interviews and observations sampling); data analysis methods are still not appropriately reported (e.g. only brief mentions to analytical concepts in relation to the chart review and interviews, which are not described or explained) or not reported at all (e.g. observations).

It is of course appropriate to use an implementation conceptual framework in implementation research, but it is not appropriate for a conceptual framework (which is not a methodological framework, as previously noted and acknowledge by authors) to replace fundamental principles and steps involved in research design. Thus, the reporting of the methods should adhere to principles and rationale of the latter, rather than the former.

Given that these and other methodological points have been raised in earlier rounds and in view of their persistence in this revised version, my conclusion remains that the methodological basis of this study was actually of poor quality, rather than just poorly reported.

Finally, I would like to note that given the reformulation of the study aims, such methodological concerns are now perhaps even more meaningful than they were in the previous version of this manuscript. This now raises the question as to whether the approach and procedures involved in this piece of work (even if well reported) were appropriate to either identify cognitive and structural needs of service providers, or understand how stakeholders valued feedback from the CCT. For example, the way interviews were used (i.e. not recorded and only for 'design purposes, rather than formal qualitative analyses' as stated by the authors) would not seem particularly consistent with the aims as currently reported, but specifically and pragmatically targeted to developing the toolkit to support the program as a clinical service, which was the sole focus of the original study aim.

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

No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**

If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**

If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

**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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