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Author’s response to reviews:

Please find below the point by point response to the comments.

Best regards

Linda Cambon, on behalf of the coauthors.

Commentary 1:

We instead focus on assessing those we know have been through a competitive peer review process to receive funding from a nationally or internationally recognised research agency. Although your study has received financial support, it is not clear if this has been obtained via a competitive grant application process. Without further evidence, we will have to assume the protocol falls outside of our scope.
Response: The project received funding from a nationally or internationally recognized research agency, obtained via a competitive grant application process. It’s précised P15.

The response letter is joined as supplementary data.

Commentary 2:

A second major concern is that the protocol is that the methods are not sufficiently well reported. For example, you state that data will be collected to document the support scheme’s mechanisms and contexts but no detail is provided on how and what data will be collected. Please ensure that your study conforms to the RAMESES II reporting standards for realist evaluations.

Response: Please, find the linkage between RAMESES II reporting standard and our submission. Moreover, we modified the article to provide the details asked.

Title

In article: P1

Summary

In article: P2

Introduction

Rational for evaluation: P3/6, lines 56-136

Program theory: P7, lines 177-181

Evaluation questions: P6, lines 139-155

Ethical approval: P14-15

Methods

Rational for using realistic evaluation: P6, lines 156-174

Environment: P6, lines 139-147

Describe the program policy: P8/9, lines 211 - 229
Describe or justify the evaluation design: P7/8, lines 176-208

Data collection methods: P10/11, lines modified and table 1 and 2 P 21-23 (modified in text)

Recruitment process and sampling strategy: P10 (agreement) and P11/12 (modified in text)

Data analysis: P12/13

Results: It is a protocol

Details of participants: It is a protocol

Main findings: It is a protocol

Discussion

Summary of findings: It is a protocol

Strengths, limitations: It is a protocol

Comparison with existing literature: It is a protocol

Conclusion: It is a protocol

Funding and conflicts of interest: P15