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Reviewer's report:

The author has done a good job of addressing comments in this revision. There is much more detail about how the review was carried out, about the models and frameworks included and some additional information that contextualises what is being reported.

I have some additional comments on this revision, which may require some further attention:

Major revisions
- I am still not convinced on the way in which the theories/models/frameworks have been categorised (p6). It is stated that three type of theories, models and frameworks were identified, which are then further broken down into 5 categories. The challenge of course is that there is overlap - which makes labelling things as types and also categories potentially confusing. I'd like to challenge the author further to find a better way to represent this taxonomy.

- on p18 a statement is made about it unlikely there will ever be a grand implementation theory - which I do not disagree with this statement - it might be worth mentioning May’s attempt at the development of a general implementation theory

- In the conclusion I think it would be helpful for the author to give us some further indication of the utility of his taxonomy - addressing a bit more directly the 'so what' question.
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