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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. This is an important area of study and this paper will significantly contribute to the growing field of implementation science. Overall the manuscript is clearly and logically presented.

The background appropriate sets the scene and positions the need for the study. The methods are detailed in their description. I would have preferred to see a more comprehensive and structured search of the literature to identify measurements for practice improvement. The current approach to searching the literature is a significant limitation to the findings and one that should be noted in the limitations sections.

I have some minor comments listed below to also consider:
Page 3 line 11-12: Remove "we aimed to do this" from the abstract, background section.
Page 13 line 10-12: "27 proposals to remove questions, and with six of the seven proposals to keep questions, meaning six questions were kept and 28 removed." More detail is required to explain how the group in the consensus meeting decided to removed on of the seven questions proposed to be kept.

I wish the author all the best in obtaining publication.
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Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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**Quality of written English**
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Needs some language corrections before being published
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