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Reviewer's report:

Overall, I think the idea behind this works, but I would like to see more explanation.

P6: Note, on your purposeful sampling (which reads as maximum variation purposeful) the focus is very much on the mental health field.

P6: Note, I cannot access reference 9 - it comes up on a CV - but I cannot find an actual version of the text. It would have been really useful to see this paper help me.

P6/7: I think you really need to offer a novice reader more access to the ideas behind Concept Mapping - and I note you make no reference to the Go-Zones in the Data Analysis section.

P7: I think we need more detail about labeling process of clusters - (probably in methods, as well). So, I know software actually suggest labels, did you use this?

I am more than aware that parsimony and distinction is very (very) tricky in this work but as yet, I need to be convinced. Now this could be a product of the final cluster labels you have chosen, but I really feel this is going to be key going forward. I'm very concerned how people may read this, and may simply think these glosses 'useful', 'easy' etc are what we should be focusing on as a community. I think you really need to unpack the very artful basis such work can take.

So, for example, I'm not sure how Factor 2 - 'Fits organizational activities' makes sense in terms the Cluster 'Useful' - when the point cluster map, make more sense of it in terms of 'Acceptable'. However, I note that Factor 29 'Meaningful' could make sense in either cluster (note that, this in Quad 3 - and this also make sense, as it is such a vague statement - and so you could argue that, given it's vagueness, it could easily fall in 'Acceptable' - as something is meaningful is going to be acceptable.) Clearly, I could unpack some of the other factor in the same way.

The key issue here is that, in going forward, the labels are glosses for a range of work that could be focused on. You need to stress to readers that the key issue is the factors themselves - and in part, that they should also look at Go-Zone (especially Quad 3) which offers another way to make sense of and act on your data set - especially around issue of evaluation.

P8: Now I am very surprised that you do not focus on the Go-Zone. As noted above, clearly, this offers a different way to read your findings, as I would be really focusing on those elements
in Quad 1 - as they offer a very specific area to focus on - and very much losing Quad 3. I note that, in Table 1, you make reference to the quadrant but do tell the reader why this is important. I note that you briefly make a nod to this with the sentence - 'some ratings suggested items that need to be removed due to lack of importance (e.g., "requires no expertise," ) or edited due to lack of clarity (e.g., "focused").' - but you need to do more.

P9: As outlined above, I think you need to unpack limitations more.

Level of interest
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors'
responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal