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Reviewer’s report:

This is a potentially very interesting article. The Work-As-Imagined (WAI) vs Work-As-Done (WAD) distinction is potentially of great value in thinking about implementation and guidelines; it resonated with me immediately, but is not an application that had occurred to me before. The whole manuscript is really quite well written.

Unfortunately, the present manuscript is stuck betwixt and between 3 incompatible aspirations:
- 1- an introduction to FRAM analysis and argument for its potential usefulness
- 2- an application of FRAM analysis to 2 specific problems to an audience no familiar with it
- 3- a technical report of 2 FRAM analyses

I confess I was not familiar with FRAM analysis prior to reading this report. But I suspect the authors’ think more potential Implementation Science readers are not, either — why else would one include such basic introductory domains as Figure 1 and the 2nd two paragraphs under “FRAM” heading?

My recommendations depend on which of the 3 manuscripts the authors really want to write.

If it is -1-, then please:
- discuss the relationship between FRAM as an approach to distinguishing WAI vs WAD in relation to other approaches. Drawing the distinction between WAI and WAD has, of course, been one of the core ways ethnographers, particularly those of a certain anti-establishment bent, have defined themselves for decade. How does FRAM build upon yet break from that tradition?
- take us much more slowly through FRAM network construction. What do TCORPI mean at the vertices of each hexagon? How does one decide which steps are primitive enough to warrant their own hexagon? How is the network laid out down such that these things are somehow readily interpretable, rather than simply being a hairball?

If -2-, then please:
- a condensed version of -1- is clearly needed
- a methods section is needed that is actually a description of the reproducible methods used to generate the results. Presumably this involves a discussion of the field work and how WAD is actually ascertained. How is variation across providers or sites in WAD measured and incorporated? The current methods section is really just a description of two case sites, not a description of how the analysis was actually done.

If -3-, then, please consider, with editorial guidance, whether Implementation Science is the right journal of your — you may want to presume a degree of familiarity with FRAM that is greater than Implementation Science’s readers have to offer.
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