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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review this short report. The paper is clear, well written and addresses an important topic. The methods used appear relevant and the results are interesting. I have however a problem in understanding Figure 1 and raise a couple of other issues that might contribute to improve the paper.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. I find the point map in Figure 1 difficult to grasp. For example: Does the location of the strategies (the graphs) also tell something about how they relate to each other? Are the sizes of the graphs a consequence of something? Of what? The figure would benefit of text that tells more about how the point map should be interpreted.

2. In the text on page 6 you tell about the relationship between feasibility and importance rating and provide a correlation coefficient =0.7. In the additional file, the last slide, the (as I understand it) same correlation coefficient is 0.88?

Minor Essential Revisions

3. In the background you refer to publications calling for a more distinct terminology on implementation strategies. Additionally to your initiative on this issue also other initiatives appear to be ongoing, for example Colquhon 2014. What is the risk for that the different initiatives result in competing taxonomies on implementation strategies? What will that imply for (in)consistency in the field? Think this is something that you might bring up to discussion.

4. All participants in the study (except one) are recruited from the United States. While implementation is highly context dependent this probably also goes for how implementation strategies are considered. With a more internationally composed sample I believe that the results might have been somewhat different. The paper would benefit if this was addressed as a limitation in the discussion section.

Discretionary Revisions

None
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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