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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this interesting article which usefully identifies some of the challenges of implementing new innovations in secondary care as well as highlighting the challenges of co-ordinating services and competing agendas between Primary and Secondary Care. On the whole the article is clearly written and well presented. My recommendation is that the article should be published, but I think some revisions to aid clarity and embellish the contribution of the article are needed. The main point is making it clearer about why NPT extended was used and if there are any lessons about the application of extended NPT that can be discussed in the context of this study. More detailed comments below.

1. Abstract conclusion – Normalization Process Theory is stated as the theoretical framework used. Should this be changed to extended Normalization Process Theory?

2. Description of Extended NPT and justification for use in the background

   • I think the paper would benefit from some sense of the rationale for using extended NPT (as opposed to ‘standard’ NPT) would be useful. It would be helpful if more is made of the article’s contention that extended NPT goes beyond individual psychological models and network approaches. I.e. May’s Toward a general theory paper builds upon NPT and incorporates psychological and network perspectives for a more comprehensive theoretical orientation to studies.

   • Was the intention of the study to also test the extended NPT? This is not clear in the background and study aims. To my knowledge this is one of the earliest (the first?) empirical studies to use ENPT. This links to a later point about the discussion, but what were the issues or learning points (if any)?

3. Interview procedure

   • Additional explanation about box 1 is required. The ENPT constructs are included under theme 2. Clarification how the ENPT constructs influenced the interview guide is required in the main text. Were these embedded under all questions (inc. theme 1)? Or just restricted to theme 2? The current discussion only discusses how the topic guide was based on the elements of the IOF initiative.
4. Coding / analysis

• It would be useful and interesting to gain more insight into how the authors approached coding. Did researchers code data that could not be explained / incorporated into extended NPT? How was this dealt with? How did the authors manage tensions between being aware of extended NPT constructs and balancing a (partially) inductive approach?

5. Reporting of results

• Related to the analysis process, it would be useful to know what themes were identified and how they fitted together to constitute the extended NPT constructs. Again, were there any themes identified which could not be accounted for by extended NPT? This might be something that could be produced as a table.

• Minor point, in the second and third sentences under 1) capacity, the word manifest is used in quick succession. Perhaps use a different word for variation?

• My feeling is that the current presentation of the findings, split between an overarching narrative and a box containing exemplifying quotes perhaps do not tease out some of the subtle nuances of the data to fully do it justice. For example, under section 2) Potential the first point discussed is the enthusiasm for the new service – directly placing the quote underneath the assertion and contextualising why staff are enthusiastic (i.e. historical desire for it, something that has been asked for a long time) would be helpful for the reader. So my preference is for the data to appear within the main text with some extra contextualisation. Doing this may also help you to relate inductive themes identified to the enhanced NPT constructs (see my first comment in this section).

6. Discussion / conclusions

• I was left wondering if there were any lessons or insights drawn from the study about using extended NPT alongside an empirical study. This is touched upon in the conclusion, but a thoroughgoing discussion is not provided (indeed, this may not be possible). It may not have been the intention of the authors to think about examining the application of the theory in practice in this way, but it would be helpful to learn about any insights gained from doing so (and bolster the claim made in the conclusion).
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