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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this interesting paper on using facilitation to improve uptake of Urinary incontinence guidelines.

This pragmatic RCT was conducted over several European countries in the Long Term care environment and sought to test 3 different facilitation approaches of carrying intensity to support the implementation of the guidelines.

In addition, the paper reports on the use of the Alberta context guide as well as using the PARIHS framework as the theoretical underpinning for the study.

Overall a very well written article with a nice introduction to set the stage as well as a good methods section. The authors do refer frequently to a process paper which details the intervention and possibly other information as well which may be important to include in this paper as well. It should be able to stand alone. Whilst I understand it is hard to fit it all in, I think a greater depth of detail about the settings is important- for example, given this was a cross-country study- what are the major differences/ similarities in terms of health system- is long term care this a publicly funded in all countries? What is the staffing like, what level of training did the facilitators have?

How was the 'fidelity' to the training sessions?

The authors mention in the discussion that the null results may have been because of the topic- lack of buy-in- How was the topic determined? It was not clear.

There are a lot of tables/ lots of findings- do all need to be included? For example, given lack of data sample for the secondary outcomes, you could consider a summary paragraph. I think this is an important finding in itself, that challenges with collecting site data within a quality improvement initiative.
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