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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this study, which I found very well described and argued.

I only have some suggestions to make, which I would trust the authors to consider and act upon.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Methods
The authors say they have used extended Normalization Process Theory, providing the appropriate reference which illustrates it. From a methodological perspective, as NPT is increasingly used in implementation research - also by researchers who haven't taken part in its development (see McEvoy 2014) - I think it would be of interest to have an additional paragraph that explains how this extended approach differs from the previous ones and its added value.

2. Sample: the authors claim their "aim of conducting criterion sampling". It would be necessary to specify the selected criteria.

3. Results
Capacity page 10
I had difficulties with the following paragraph:
"The visibility of these two kinds of support meant that a culture of co-operation developed around the intervention. This culture depended on shared expertise, as well as belonging to a co-operative group, and so distance from the centre of the service was an important factor that affected behavior. A key problem for participants was therefore securing the co-operation and interest of GPs.

The variable “distance from the centre” does not seem appropriately introduced. It only appears here and not sufficiently discussed.

4. A great emphasis is put on the effectiveness of the “fracture-prevention coordinator”.
I understand this was a specific implementation strategy set up by the package and I think it should be stressed more explicitly that the complex intervention came supplied with an indispensable implementation strategy.
5. The resistance from some professionals who did not share the value of the intervention is indirectly referred to by some of the respondents. Were these negative responders included in the sample? If not this should be highlighted in the limitations, as their negative attitude could have determined their unwillingness to be interviewed.
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