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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

No major compulsory revisions needed.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Page 9. In their comments on the first revision, the authors explained that the theory of push and pull has been chosen because they wanted to illustrate sustainability of the ACCs and that they wanted to go beyond implementation and organization theories because they did elaborate on implementation and organization already in previous publications. This is an acceptable explanation. However, the way they processed this explanation in the manuscript is rather poor.

2. Page 10. The authors commented that they added the selection criteria in the text. They did so by specifying their definition of the category. In some categories of participants however, purposive sampling was used. It remains unclear which purpose was served. For example: 5 civil servants out of 11 were asked to participate in the study. What determined the choice for those 5 civil servants? Which considerations played a role in this choice?

Discretionary Revisions

No discretionary revisions needed.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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