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Intro:

Thank you for a comprehensive intro -

I wonder if lines p43-60 are needed? I was expecting the rest of the paper to focus on diabetes, cancer and CHD but then these were not mentioned subsequently so does the reader need to know this context?

Methods:

Phase 1:

I think it would be helpful to have the professional background of those interviews as well as organisations?

Why was a focus group method chosen?

Can the topic guide be included?

It states that it was inductive thematic analysis but given that a coding manual was developed based on TPB would this not be deductive? Sorry if I misunderstood?
Phase 2:

Can a copy of the questionnaire be included?

What constitutes direct and indirect beliefs that are being tested? Having examples of questionnaire would help reader understand this?

What are the hypotheses? These are only presented at the end of the manuscript can these be stated in the methods? I think presenting a Figure here would make things clearer?

Why did you test combined direct and indirect beliefs? What do the solid and dotted arrows in Figure 5 mean?

Results

Phase 1:

I was unclear how findings 1-3 linked to the theory of planned behaviour? Can this be made clearer? Or is it that your findings found additional constructs in addition to those outlined by TPB?

Phase 2:

I think Figure 5 is a helpful summary but there are multiple tests performed on a sample size of 58 I wonder if bivariable correlations may be more reliable given the sample size?

I am still unclear after reading the results what constitutes a direct belief and an indirect belief? Can the content of the questionnaire be used in Figure 5 to help the reader understand?
Discussion

I am afraid I found the discussion hard to follow because of my questions raised above. I think if authors can explain more what TPB measures were used for study Phase2 this would make things easier to follow (e.g. an indirect measure of a health care professionals PBC is x, whereas a direct measure is x).

I think the cross sectional nature and sample size needs to be raised as a limitation?

Can comparisons with other similar research be conducted? For example have other qual studies looked at SSM but drawn on different theories? Can any synergies be drawn?

What implementation interventions are needed based on findings? (If replicated in a larger sample?)

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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