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Reviewer's report:

I found this paper to be of interest to readers of Implementation Science and well written. I thought the use of qualitative methods incorporating Normalisation Process Theory (NPT) to explore the implementation of secondary fracture prevention services after hip fracture could complement and extend existing literature. I have detailed some suggestions for minor and discreptional revisions under the relevant headings below.

Introduction

Discretionary Revisions

I thought that the introduction section was a useful summary of existing literature. I felt it may benefit from some more background detail on NPT as well as how the extended model the authors used fits with the original theory (e.g. perhaps a diagram and short summary of other elements) for purposes of clarity for the reader.

Methodology

The methods used seemed appropriate and were well described.

Discretionary Revisions

I would suggest that demographic information relating to participants be included in a tabular format within the ‘sample’ section in any subsequent draft as this would make it clearer for the reader.

It may be helpful to display an example of the codes generated during the analysis process which could be included as an additional figure (e.g. original single code list described in the data analysis section) for the purposes of transparency of process.

Results

I thought the results presented were very interesting, coherent and well presented. I thought the boxes with quotes worked particularly well to illuminate the findings within each component.

Discretionary Revisions
I felt that within the text under each heading, the provision of examples might be useful. For example within the ‘Potential’ heading, specific examples of how co-ordinators ‘glued’ together different professional cultures and ensured there was agreement might be useful.

Minor essential Revisions

Please describe abbreviations in full when used in the first instance (e.g. DXA reports/scans).

Discussion and conclusions

I felt that the discussion and conclusions were well balanced and well supported by the data and demonstrated important implications for health services.

Discretionary Revisions

The strengths and weaknesses of the study was a useful section which was well written. I felt that it may be useful to articulate how the challenges of the overlapping nature of the constructs within NPT were addressed within the current study.
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