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Reviewer’s report:

- Please supply a reference number for the ethics committee approval
- At the end of the abstract, please include the date of the trial registration and indicate that the trial was retrospectively registered
- Please populate the SPIRIT checklist included with the manuscript, and include a reference to the checklist within the main text of the manuscript
- Process evaluations address how interventions work, not how well trials work (see the MRC process evaluation guidance, which was referenced). Some sections on process evaluation (e.g. the first paragraph on page 8, in the 'Design' section) conflate the two. Please make this distinction clear in the manuscript.
- Please include a separate section on analysis of qualitative process evaluation data - at the moment it is included in the 'statistical considerations' section. More generally, the different sections on the process evaluation and their titles could be presented more clearly in the manuscript.
- It needs to be clearer how the conceptual framework (Hasson 2010) and the Theoretical Domains Framework will be used together for the process evaluation (Page 8) - good qualitative research normally uses a consistent theoretical approach throughout a study (ie. for both data collection and data analysis) which is not what is implied in the manuscript at the moment.
- The description of the theoretical basis of the qualitative research and the analytical approach are also not very consistent. Two approaches (Hasson 2010 and the Theoretical Domains Framework) are described as underpinning the process evaluation/qualitative analysis, but the section on analysis on pages 14-15 describes 'emerging themes' implying they are relatively exploratory and inductive (which is also not very compatible with the approach of using a structured interview schedule) and also describes categories based on key research questions for the study rather than theoretical categories from Hasson/Theoretical Domains Framework.
- The description of the qualitative analysis process should also include a bit more detail and include one or more references for the analytical approach being used.
- Please indicate how many service provider organisations and individuals will be included in the process evaluation section, on page 10

- A 'questionnaire' is mentioned in the process evaluation section on page 12 but not in previous descriptions of the process evaluation.

- There are a number of typos/omissions in the text: please indicate PDRA as an acronym the first time this title is used in the text (line 14, page 10); the oTTer programme is referred to as 'TT' on line 35, page 10; the sentence on line 29/30 on page 12 needs editing.
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