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Reviewer's report:

I am sorry to have to recommend the paper should not be accepted by Trials as I think it needs to be reworked before it can be published. I was a bit unclear exactly what it was that you were exploring in your paper. There is a lot of literature about the differences between pragmatic and explanatory trial design and implications for implementation of the results. Including the stakeholders in a discussion about trial design is interesting but the topic might have been explored in more depth. I was unclear why you didn't include clinicians as a group - the ones included were included because they were in another stakeholder role. As the main implementers of research evidence I would have thought they would be important to interview. Specific suggestions: 1. the introduction should really argue the case for doing this qualitative study, especially when the limitations of pragmatic trials are so well explained in other research; 2. the title 'maximising' is not really what you have covered in your results; 3. the results needs to be streamlined and synthesised to include only the most relevant data and quotes; 4. include some implementation outcome definitions if that is what you are looking at.

Level of interest
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article of limited interest

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable

Quality of figures
All images and figures within the manuscript should be genuine i.e. without evidence of manipulation. No specific feature within an image may be enhanced, obscured, moved, removed, or introduced. If you have concerns about the veracity of the figures you should choose the first option below.

Statistical review
Is it essential that this manuscript is seen by an expert statistician? If so, please give your reasons in your report.
Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal

Were you mentored through this peer review?

No