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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript.

The authors describe the process of review, development and adaptation of guidelines for the purpose of implementation. Overall, the manuscript is well written and provides some useful insights for health professionals and researchers embarking on guideline adaptation.

Minor Essential Revisions
1. In Table 3, the acronym PIPOH is used – please include the full text.

Discretionary Revisions:
2. The title of the manuscript implies that the guideline implementation process will be described. However, after 24 months 3/5 of the cases were at the external review phase, while the remaining 2 cases were still formulating their recommendations. The actual implementation process is not described, although planning for implementation was undertaken during the adaptation phase. “Guideline adaptation and implementation planning …” may more accurately reflect the content of the manuscript.

3. In the Abstract, the phrase “guideline entity mandate and infrastructure” is unclear. The meaning later becomes clear in the body of the manuscript. Suggest this is re-worded in the Abstract to provide clarity.

4. Data management and evaluation protocols are mentioned on page 8 – could examples be provided in Table 3?

5. A number of groups and individuals are mentioned throughout the text e.g., partnership, case teams, steering committee, case panels, chair, facilitators. While some of these are described in the Discussion section, a definition/description would provide context for the reader.

6. While the references for the conceptual framework and taxonomy for facilitation are provided (refs 13-15), a brief description of the framework would strengthen this section.

7. Version 3 of CAN-IMPLEMENT is referred to in the text. A brief explanation of the background to development of this framework e.g., development of versions 1 and 2, would provide greater context for the reader.
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