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Reviewer's report:

1. Background:

1.1 While you did an excellent job describing the importance of pragmatic measures, I feel like you should also explain the strategic position of this current study in this section. The fact that this study builds on a previous systematic revision and your study protocol ("Advancing implementation science through measure development and evaluation: a study protocol") is very important to understanding this article. For example, I attempted to read your reference #9 ("Defining and developing a pragmatic construct for implementation measures") but it is not publicly available. Without a clear description of this study's importance, and a lack of familiarity with your group’s work, this article runs the risk of not being relevant to outside readers.

2. Participants:

2.1 You describe a "concept mapping activity". Could you please provide more detailed information on this activity? (i.e. whether it was in person, how long it lasted, how many of the participants contributed at each moment, etc).

2.2 You state that data collection and analysis lasted from March-October 2016. How many weeks or months were dedicated to the concept mapping activity? Were there different phases or steps to the activity? (In my personal opinion, since this was not a clinical study, the specific months should be omitted. However, I will leave this to your criteria)

3. Data Collection

3.1 In line with my comment 1.1, I felt that this study requires more context to understand how it fits in with your previous and future research. For example, you mention that the 47 criteria for pragmatic measures were generated from a previous systematic review and semi-structured interview study. However, when I searched the article that you cite, it is not
publicly available. It is important for your readers to be able to see your inputs for this paper, and if they are not publicly available, they should be described in greater depth.

3.2 You make a jump between talking about "pragmatic measures" and then measuring solely on the basis of "clarity and importance". I would have liked a better transition where you explain how you are operationalizing "pragmatic" and a justification of why "clarity and importance" are measures of pragmatism.

Table 1

Please put your criteria in some type of order, preferably numeric (within each category of course). It is difficult for the reader to compare Figure 1 to the Table 1, especially for the "Easy" and "Useful" categories where there are more criteria.

Figure 1:

While you explain that items 7 and 19 were moved, it is confusing how you show them in the figure with a direct line between items 12 and 3. Is there any special relationship between items 12 and 7 and 3 and 19? If not, I suggest not drawing a direct line between them.

GENERAL COMMENT:

I am very excited to see your future work ("rating criteria that could inform measure development and the assessment of measures' pragmatic qualities [...] yielding and revealing measures that are psychometrically strong and pragmatic"). I have no doubt that your future criteria will be immensely useful for the community of implementation scientists. I also can easily recognize that your research team has made great strides in the theoretical realm of pragmatic implementation criteria, specifically with your systematic review.

That being said, I feel that this article runs the risk of getting lost in this "sandwich" between your previous theoretical findings and future practical applications. The criteria that you measured in this article are still not usable, yet you do not go into more depth or advance theoretical aspects. I strongly suggest that you highlight both theoretical and practical aspects of your study, as well as contextualize this study in regards to your previous work. If you do not make this paper understandable as a stand-alone document, this article may not be interesting or relevant to many readers outside your research group.
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