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Author’s response to reviews:

We thank the reviewers for their constructive comments, we are particularly pleased to hear that both reviewers agree this manuscript makes an important contribution to the literature.
Below and in the table attached we list our response to their comments, which have been highlighted in yellow within the revised manuscript.

Reviewer 1 Comments

1. The manuscript could benefit from a review for grammatical clarity, to improve readability. For example, the final sentence in the results section…

   Edited the specific example (which is highlighted), and have undertaken a check throughout the manuscript to improve readability where needed (p4)

2. Which guidance in particular are you referring to?

   Methodological guidance [then referenced at the end of the sentence] (p 5)

3. A little more information about realist informed inquiries…

   A sentence has been added (p5)

4. You haven't clearly stated the aim of your study in the manuscript…

   Highlighted the aim in first para of methods section (p6)

5. …engagement was only with professional stakeholders…

   Added a sentence (p7)

6. … detailed explanation of the qualitative rigour associated with your data analysis…

   A number of sentences have been added to be clearer about who was involved in the analysis process (p9 & p 22)

7. Please use the abbreviations EF and IF consistently…
Changed throughout to be consistent (will await editorial view on whether first abbreviation should be in a Table or text)

8. … These feelings were strongly expressed by those who had English …

Removed, it was out of place.

9. … this section reads a little repetitively

Edited some text out to reduce repetitiveness (on p15/6)

10. … Do you feel the explanatory account of the antecedents and contingencies fully account?

We feel that this study does account for the contingencies we observed in this realist study. One of the partner papers (Harvey et al – in review concurrently) unpacks the facilitation experience more fully. This is complementary account, using different methods, but will enable readers (should they wish) to gain an even fuller account of what happened with the facilitation interventions. We have made a clearer reference to this in the discussion section (p 22).

Reviewer 2

1. Readers not familiar with the FIRE trial have to wait until pg 9 line 54 to realize that it is about urinary incontinence in a residential care setting.

Added some text in the first paragraph (p5).

2. … Unexpected lack of difference …

Added a couple of sentences to the discussion (p18)