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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting, well-written, thought-provoking paper that will serve the field well. I would suggest a few edits to make it even stronger.

Abstract: Would it be possible to list the suggested criteria in the abstract? I know there are length limits but without these criteria the abstract feels a bit vague.

Background: Please explain how you and / or the papers cited here define underuse, misuse or superficial use of theories. If possible, please provide examples. This will help ground the paper a bit.

Results: Table 1 is a bit of a teaser! It would be helpful to include a table that gave more detail on which models were used for each of the purposes listed there.

Discussion: It should be mentioned, when discussing which criteria for picking theories are most important, that importance may differ between projects.

Overall this paper would be richer with more Discussion about what these findings mean for the field.

It is not clear enough that the criteria posed by these authors are those that were given as options in their survey. Further, the authors do not suggest a prioritization scheme for these criteria; this would be helpful.

Conclusion: The two examples given in the Conclusion feel a bit odd as they are the first examples given of the use of criteria to select a guiding theory. I think this text might be better used in the Background to illustrate this selection process.

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/](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