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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript teases apart and defines the different types of implementation strategies by clarifying the determinants and levels for each strategy using Wandersman's interactive systems framework. It helps differentiate strategies and constructs which serve different purposes but are often given the same name, implementation strategies. This framework could be useful in advancing both the science and practice of implementation.

Major revisions

* The terms "determinants", "targets", and "level" are used throughout the manuscript. Sometimes these terms do not seem clearly defined or consistently used. Offering clear definitions of each, consistency and clarity in terms throughout would greatly improve the clarity of the framework and strengthen the manuscript.

* Adding a visual of the framework (e.g., possibly linking it to the ISF visual) may help offer clarity around the levels and determinants.

* The sections about clarifying strategies by linking them to determinants (p7 l14-36) and levels (p7l41-p8l17) do not flow as easily as the rest of the manuscript. Putting these in context and adding more clarity around the definitions could help set these sections up to present the framework more clearly.

* Given the importance of the connections between levels of the ISF, it seems particularly important to mention the arrows linking levels of the ISF as these are where the "implementation strategies" often fit.

* The description of scale-up strategies seemed inconsistent. It is defined as being similar to integration strategies (p14l41) but goes on to describe what appear to be more system-level capacity building strategies and possibly dissemination strategies.

* Rather than presenting Proctor's recommendations in the discussion, these could be used to frame how you set up Table 1 and help with defining the determinants, targets… There is also inconsistency between Proctor's terms and the terms used in the manuscript (e.g., actor,
action, action target). Given the goal of the manuscript is to improve consistency in language, using Proctor's terms and definitions could help offer clarity and consistency

Minor revisions

* Given the goals of the manuscript and potential impact on the field, the opening paragraph of the background and abstract could be strengthened to make a more compelling argument for this framework

* Add references for frameworks and lists p5 l21

* What are the 4 components from Colquhoun's review (p7l24)?

* You later say there are 5 categories (p8l28), where did the 5th one come from? How are these similar or different from Colquhoun's?

* It would be helpful to add whether each of the newly classified implementation strategies is EBI-specific or not (e.g., are the capacity building strategies EBI specific?)

* Although you have included several examples, some of the most commonly cited examples were not included (e.g., EPIS, EPOC taxonomy, NIRN stages). Although the goal is not to make an exhaustive list, adding a few more would likely be helpful to readers familiar with these strategies.

* The example on p14l29 about providing patients with CRC screening kits appears to be more of an EBI than an integration strategy. This may be because more details are required; however it might be better to include another example using more common integration strategies.
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