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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Paul Wilson

Thank you for your comments and the opportunity to amend our manuscript for publication in Implementation Science. We have retained the original review aim and inclusion criteria, and have reserved reference to “effectiveness” to the included experimental studies. For the non-experimental studies, we have recognised the relative paucity of effectiveness evidence and have explicitly stated that the thematic synthesis of non-experimental studies was used to explore the factors perceived to be associated with effective strategies and the inter-relationship between these factors. We have also built on our discussion point, describing the need for these factors to be rigorously evaluated.

*Changes to thematic synthesis results section- first sentence*

“Due to the relative paucity of evidence for effectiveness studies, a thematic synthesis of non-experimental studies was used to explore the factors perceived to be associated with effective strategies and the inter-relationship between these factors.”
*Changes to discussion section- final paragraph*

“The conceptualisation of factors perceived to be associated with effective strategies and the inter-relationship between these factors should be interpreted with caution as it was based on low levels of evidence according to the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) of Australia designations. Therefore, there is a need for the association between these factors and effective strategies to be rigorously evaluated.”

We hope our response and manuscript changes adequately address any concerns. If changes have not been to the editors’ satisfaction, we are prepared to make further changes as necessary.

Kind regards

Mitchell Sarkies