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Reviewer's report:

This article discusses how best to implement interventions in hospital settings. The topic of how to ensure that interventions are effectively implemented is one likely to be of interest to a wide audience. I found it generally clearly written, well-conducted, interesting to read and providing a clear outline of existing evidence in this area. My most serious comment on the paper is (4) below regarding the inclusion criteria which I did not find clear in the current draft.

I have the following suggestions which I feel would improve the clarity of the paper:

1) More information on how framework analysis was conducted should be provided. For example, who undertook the initial coding, how were codes refined etc

2) Quality ratings- was a formal analysis of agreement between reviewers undertaken, how many people evaluated each article?

3) Screening of abstracts etc how many people performed this? Was it cross-checked, what was the agreement between reviewers?

4) Inclusion criteria of patient-focused intervention- this criteria seems very vague to me, even looking at the table with further details I'm not sure how the authors operationalised this when searching. I'm particularly confused about this given that there were a relatively small number of studies for such a broad criteria e.g. on decision aids only 2 studies were identified.

5) I wonder if a summary table highlighting how many studies identified each barrier/facilitator would also be helpful- at the moment this information can be gauged by looking at the study table however it is slightly difficult to identify. Were there any barriers which were explored in the studies but were found not to be important (e.g. in the small number of quantitative studies)? Perhaps these null results could also be included.

6) The authors refer to existing implementation frameworks eg. PARiHS and theories in their introduction and discussion- personally I would welcome further discussion of how their findings fit with these existing frameworks.
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