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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. I found it of particular interest given that I also work with Kroger and have worked to improve implementation of MTM.

This project was very interesting and addresses an important issue in community pharmacy (and pharmacy in general). I thought that the approach to teach pharmacists and staff a different way to look at and approach MTM in the community pharmacy was unique. My understanding is that the project centered around helping pharmacists identify the level of service that needs to be provided. Many times pharmacists may use an "all or nothing" approach, and this framework or "way of thinking" sought to help pharmacists have a more tiered approach to delivering MTM services.

While I really like this approach and think that it is very interesting, it did take me reading the paper a couple of times to make it clear what the project was and how everything fit together. I have a few suggestions that will hopefully help clarify the project during a first read of the paper for future audiences.

Abstract:

Objectives: the objectives identified in the abstract vs. the manuscript to not seem to fully match. In the manuscript, the "development of the framework" is cited as an objective, but the development of the framework is not truly described. Looking at the impact of the educational intervention using the framework and pharmacists' perceptions of MTM/self-efficacy seem to be the true objectives of the research. It would be helpful to have the objectives in both places match.

Manuscript:

Background: I think that the majority of the background does a good job setting the stage for what MTM is, why it is important, what adaptation is in the context of implementation science (IS), and how IS has been used to address issues with MTM so far. I think that the second paragraph could provide some more specific examples of the problem to really tease out what you guys are trying to address.
To me, these sentences:

"Importantly, the Core Elements framework "does not represent a specific minimum or maximum level of all services that could be delivered by pharmacists."20 Furthermore, although the use of the five elements are required, the delivery of these elements may vary by setting" really start to get at the meat of the issue—the fact that we don't have specificity of what LEVEL of service should be delivered and that it is likely dictated by setting (as well as the other inputs/outputs you identify in your framework). I think that this is a key sentence, but I missed what you meant during the first read. The next sentence, I think, attempts to explain and give an example, but it might be more useful to give an even more specific example like you do later in the paper: perhaps what a community pharmacist may do in a situation vs an am care pharmacist.

Methods: Interventions and Strategies

The 60-minute webinar: was this an interactive webinar or more lecture based? I see that there were case examples, but did the participants have a way to ask questions or do any type of active learning. Also, how was the framework presented to the pharmacists? Was it presented more at a high-level as discussed here in the manuscript, or were examples used? I think it would be helpful to include such example in the manuscript to further explain the usefulness of the framework.

MTM Adaptability Framework:

pg 12 line 4. I think a word is missing: "In particular, it does NOT create a new MTM service - rather it."

The supplement at the end of the manuscript is a great example of how to use the framework, which I think is what is missing from the description of the framework in the manuscript. It would be helpful to refer to the supplement during this section to help the audience fully grasp how to use the framework.

Semi-structured interviews

What were the open-ended surveys from?

Would it be possible to include the interview questions as a supplement? I am curious as to how the questions were asked to the key informants.

Results:

Is it possible to include the raw numbers rather than just the % increase? I realize that this may not be allowed by Kroger, which may be the reason the authors did not include it.
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