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Reviewer’s report:

Overall: This article was very interesting and well-written. Global health research will benefit from RCTs incorporating process evaluations to improve implementation and replication of effective interventions as highlighted in this paper. I am wondering why you decided to separate the qualitative results from the quantitative results, which nicely follow the RE-AIM framework, rather than weaving qualitative results within each framework piece, which would be more aligned with Table 1.

Background

* Citation numbers should be placed inside a sentence before the period, or before the comma notation.

Methods

* In row 9, you write the number of interviews and FGDs in each site. Could you also include N (total)? (You could bring up this info from the Results section (first paragraph in qualitative analysis).

* In row 26, you state that the comparison of referral rates before and after implementation is non-randomized. It seems you comparing the sites' referral rates to themselves? It would help if this line was clarified.

* For the logistic regression models, were there any control covariates used? Is this why a meta-regression was used? It is not clear in the paper why a meta-regression approach was used. I have only seen meta-regressions used for systematic literature reviews. Please explain further why this analytical approach was appropriate here.

Results

* Large numbers such as those in row 40 or 47 would benefit from commas
* Was qualitative data analyzed by level of fidelity/core component implemented correctly by site or reach to explain these results? It would have helped if the qualitative results also followed the framework layout with the quantitative results.

* Some of the information in the qualitative section should go under methods, particularly in the first paragraph.

* Figures 1 and 2 - Shouldn't these titles reflect "change in odds"?
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