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Reviewer's report:

This is a timely and interesting study that will make a substantial contribution to the literature on de-implementation. Additionally it is very clearly written and easy to read. Our comments are minor, below:

1. Lilienfeld's paper on Treatments that Harm should be included in the introduction, first paragraph.  https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26151919

2. In general, I'd like to see a little more commentary in the introduction/discussion on why de-implementation is so important. Cost to society, cost to patients, ethics? In the discussion the paper calls for additional funding opportunities - it should be more clearly detailed WHY this issue is so important.

4. On page 7, line 53, I think confusing to say 8 questions than switch to domains. I would just stick with domains.

4. Related, related, why were frameworks not coded in the grant applications? (as a 9th domain?) I'd be curious what, if any, theoretical frameworks were proposed to guide these de-implementation projects, such as the ones referenced in the Introduction.

5. Why were PCORI studies not included?

6. More clarity on the approach to coding (e.g., grounded theory; content analysis, etc.) would be helpful.

7. It would be helpful to map on whether the work on de-implementation is being published in the top IS journals (based on Norton's just published paper) or in niche journals.

7. I'd like to see more discussion of the findings that 1) several studies focused on both understanding factors and testing strategies and 2) the "surprising" amount of experimental studies given the youth of the field. Can the authors comment on their perspectives on whether this is this good or bad? Is the field getting ahead of itself? Further, descriptives on if the principal investigators were already funded DI researchers moving into this de-implementation space or other disciplines would be interesting to understand the greater reliance on RCTs.
8. Finally, I'd like a bit more commentary from the authors on how they see deimplementation fitting within the larger space of implementation science. Do they see it as a parallel stream of research that DI researchers will naturally extend into; do they see it as a new area that will be separate, etc. There is some mention of this in the discussion but it is such a critical issue and these are the authors to be commenting on this!

Thank you for this important contribution.
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