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Reviewer's report:

This project addresses an important area of need.

Background

The authors provide very limited critique of other frameworks used for scalability assessment. More information about why the existing frameworks/guides are inadequate is needed to situate this work.

Method

Definitions of scaling up and scalability are provided in the introduction. The aim indicates that a scalability assessment is the outcome desired. Scaling up is the process of implementation while scalability assessment is the pre-implementation process. Therefore please provide some logic about why frameworks for scaling up were included in the review.

Why was only Medline searched? Was consideration given to searching other than health literature for a scalability assessment?

What criteria were used to recruit the three experts? What is the justification for three?

p5 line 47 indicates tools for scaling up rather than tools to assess scalability - this loose use of terminology occurs throughout the paper and should be standardised according to the aim of the research.

Results it was unclear from the manuscript which literature included which domains. Referencing Tables 5 and 6, or figure 3 would assist.

p2 line 15 '...efficacious interventions of prevention interventions...' difficult to understand

p2 and p3 long, wordy sentences make this all difficult to read.

Methods first paragraph is poorly worded
p17 lines 1-8 - rewrite this sentence

p21 line 34 tuned or turned?

Table 4 - thick line between column 2 and 3 would help.
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