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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for making revisions to your manuscript in response to my feedback. I felt that some of the changes had provided greater clarity, but others had introduced new issues.

If you decide to revise your manuscript again, please would you ensure that any changes do not create any further issues that may need major revisions.

Specific feedback:

Lines 46 and 483:

In the Abstract and in line 483 you say that your literature review is "informed by realist synthesis methodology".

I realise this is an abstract and space is limited, but even in the main manuscript you have not explained what "informed by realist synthesis methodology" means. What have you done that is different and why?

The RAMESES publication standards Item 6 clearly states "Some realist syntheses published to date have deliberately adapted the method as first described by Pawson. Sometimes, adaptations may be entirely justifiable, but at other times they may indicate a poor grasp of realist methodology. To enable judgement to be made on adaptations, the description and rationale for adaptations should be provided. Such information will allow criticism, debate and counter criticism among review teams and users on the suitability of such adaptations, and may well facilitate methodological development."

Lines 122 to 123: The research question has not been changed.

Lines 199 to 201:

The issue I raised about your research question not being very realist has not been addressed.
I am not familiar with this definition or explanation of what a mechanism is. Please would you clarify and provide one or more references to support this definition.

I am not exactly sure what this sentence means. Are you trying to say you grouped CMOCs by how often they occurred or something else?

I am also slightly confused how you can group by regularities and prominence. Please can you explain what this means and how it was operationalised. Please clarify.

What is a framework theme?

When you say it is a "core consideration of the proposed initial theory" what does this mean?

Is this initial theory your initial programme theory?

I am not clear what the sentence that begins "from here .." means.

I thought you had already got evidence form the extraction sheets of Cs, Ms and Os.

Why do you then re-review all the data?

Please would you explain.

You have not provided any details on what the research questions were that were posed in the commissioning of the research.

Please provide these if you are going to mention this issue.
Line 330 to 331:
CMOCs don't work to refine the initial programme theory, you as the researchers do.

Lines 331 to 332:
I am not sure what this sentence means "A result of insufficiently elicited initial.."
Also are you here stating that the initial programme theory (as stated in lines 196 to 198) should now have 6 parts to it? (as shown in Box 1).
How and why did you go from a single paragraph to six programme theories?
Finally, I really can't see how you got form what you had in Figure 3 to these six programme theories. Or maybe they are not meant to be related?
This lack of transparency is a source of concern to me. For any of your recommendations, it should be possible for the reader to follow how you got from 'raw' data to CMOCs, programme theory and then recommendations.
As such, please revise the findings sections to ensure that the above is possible.

Table 2:
This table's title needs to reflect it's contents - it is a table of recommendations with details of where the evidence for the recommendations have come from and what the findings from the Delphi panel.
Please would you revise the title of this table accordingly.

Lines 364 to 365.
This sentence does not make sense.
Please would you clarify what this sentence means.

Lines 398 to 399:
This sentence does not make sense. How would you use CMOCs as implementation strategies?
Line 401:
You mention CMOCs were posed. I thought you developed and 'tested' them using data from the literature and gained consensus around their validity from practitioners using a Delphi process???

Lines 413 to 444:
You mention general principles here. Some of these are quite prescriptive - using words such as "should". Yet in lines 401 to 402, the learning you draw form the literature were not meant to be on size fits all. How would you then reconcile these two differing positions? Also, I found it hard to follow where these principles and much of the contents of these paragraphs came from. Please would you explain their origins. This relates to my point above about transparency.

Line 448:
What do you mean by the term "more positivist studies"?

Lines 484 to 486:
I am not quite sure what this sentence means. Please will you clarify.

Lines 502 to 504:
I would agree that a realist evaluation that collected data to confirm, refute or refine the CMOCs you developed from your realist review could be a possible avenue for future research. However, I am not sure what you mean by "at a lower level of abstraction."
Please would you clarify.

Line 531:
In your Conclusion, it may be sensible to be more 'realist' in your recommendations.
For example "recommendations regarding how this should be done in different contexts."
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