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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review this manuscript. The paper is very timely and interesting. It is extremely useful to get this overview of implementation research frameworks, not least because the abundance of this kind of tools. I have no major Compulsory Revisions, instead I think the paper should be published, in consideration a few Minor Essential Revisions, primarily for enhancing clarity of the paper. My comments are probably an illustration of my limited understanding of citation network analyses, but might hinder also other readers to understand essential parts of the paper.

- Please, provide more on the rational for doing a citation network analysis within the implementation science field (page 5).

- The description of the citation network analysis on page 9-10 is not that easy to follow. Probably it is not that important to understand everything but I would like to see a short summary description of what citation network analysis is all about.

- The structured literature review of the Tabak article (page 11, 3rd paragraph). I have hard to follow what this is. How do the 239 papers in this review link to the Tabak article?
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