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Reviewer's report:

Many thanks for the opportunity to review this manuscript which describes a robust and novel method for developing an appropriate and feasible behavioural intervention to address an identified need for improved guideline implementation in the chiropractic profession. This work is novel given use of this approach, and because little such research has taken place in the chiropractic profession. The Background provides a clear and concise discussion of the identified need to improve chiropractic management of those presenting with neck pain leading to articulation of key objectives. Following are some minor essential edits for the Methods and Discussion sections that would enhance the interpretation and application of the findings by others.

METHODS

The methods are valid but as they are written are confusing to the reader because the objective numbers do not align with the numbering of approach questions which do not align with the numbering of phases. The figure while very detailed does not help to clarify this issue. One can deduce that the methods address research objectives #2 to 4, but how was research objective #1 addressed?

Clarify and justify what qualitative approach was used for interviews. It appears that questions were derived from the TDF domains so was this more like a survey with open-ended questions?

Provide a few more details about how transcripts were deductively coded. Perhaps provide an example in the methods to show how statement responses were linked with specific beliefs.

Who was on the 15 member committee that attended the two-day meeting to review the initial findings. It may be the same committee you describe later in the methods but we have not yet been introduced to it in the methods for phase 1.

Comment on what information was given to committee members to help them make decisions. Somewhere in the discussion is mentioned research publications that describe effectiveness of various interventions.

DISCUSSION

In strengths and limitations explicitly comment on whether maximum variation
was achieved by purposive sampling and whether this influenced results (ie. not just based on total number of participants). Did the committee included KT experts familiar with behaviour change interventions.

Somewhere in the discussion comment on feasibility of the approach since this was supposed to be one of the considerations.

Given that this is a novel approach, users would value some insight from the investigators on what worked well or less well, and advice for others using this process.
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