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Abstract

28 - not clear what is meant by providers (also page 5 line 6/7)

Methods

Page 6, lines 4-11: describes using CFIR for both RA and in-depth but the background section implies that CFIR is just associated with the in depth analysis (page 5 16-36)

Page 6, line 53: I find the use of the term 'rich descriptions' to be very problematic as it's meaning is vague. I much prefer 'detailed' or 'in-depth'. However, I appreciate that it's a commonly used term in qualitative research so feel free to ignore this comment

Page 9, lines 38-44: the dissemination strategy culminates in a report to the funders, was this analysis submitted for peer review publication (what's the paper referenced as 13 based on?)

Page 11, line 38: relates to the point above, need to be clear about what analysis reference 13 was based on (I could probably look this up but I think that it should be explicit here)

Page 11, line 48. 'Transcripts from these interviews …' do you mean the provider interviews where you've given a breakdown or the entire data set, I think it's the latter but it's not clear

Page 12, line 4: I feel a bit uncomfortable with the term 'reliability' which is used in a different way in quantitative and survey research, the use here feels a bit different and relies on findings being 'similar'. I wonder whether a different term might be considered but the matching of concepts and findings seems robust and so just offer the comment as food for thought. I notice that in the discussion you have used the term consistent which is a better fit here.

Page 13, lines 16-43: I think the comparison needs to include more details other than the overall time taken, it's more about the researcher time involved which includes the number of researchers involved. We can probably get this to a degree from reading the methods but I think it would present a more complete picture if such details were included in figure 3 otherwise the comparison lacks value.
Pages 13-14, first para of discussion: the authors highlight that the RA was sufficient for the funders but is that the limit of what can be done with the analysis can it be published in peer review journals where it can have a wider impact (this is why I have raised the issue of reference 13 above), if for publication purposes it needs more in-depth work then this presents something of a dilemma for research teams.

Page 14, the discussion about the role of the CFIR is important as it was used on both analyses and as you point out, it's not entirely surprising that it generated similar results. However, a bigger problem which doesn't seem to be represented as a weakness is that the same research team carried out both analyses. I don't understand how the second analyses could not be influenced by the first. Unless I'm missing something obvious this seems to be fundamental issue with the paper that the authors need to engage with both in terms of the consistency of findings but also in the resource implications.

Page 15, lines 24-26: interesting that the authors note that the 'RA is insufficient for making or affirming prevalent constructs and outcomes'. However, I'm not really clear on why this is as the findings from the RA are consistent with the in-depth analysis and as such more details on the nature of the trade off would be helpful.
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