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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to see a further draft of this paper. The authors have strengthened the paper by their thorough responses to the comments received.

General: there are some instances where acronyms are not explained and additional text is not very well integrated into the existing sections.

Abstract: description of the design is difficult to follow. It would be clearer to explain that implementation, embedded and integration are stages of normalisation process theory. This amendment has not assisted clarity.

BCN is not explained before use.

Additional text in Phase 2 method is long and difficult to follow - suggest additional punctuation.

p14 line 30: please explain how a sample of 20 has been chosen.

p15 line 35: please explain and justify why 25% of transcripts will be double reviewed.

p18 lines 7-17: please explain which sections the lay members will be involved in and justify this approach. Do the researchers' mentioned on line 13 include the lay members. Further clarity is needed.
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