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Reviewer's report:

I thank the authors for their efforts in responding to my previous comments.

Looking at the further information they have provided in their response, the additional information and the revised paper, the inclusion/exclusion criteria are clearer but still ambiguous.

1) Under the category of 'not original research' the authors have included conference abstracts. These are unpublished but are likely to be original research. It looks from this and Table 1 as though there is an additional criteria of 'original studies published in journals'. The limitations of excluding grey literature should be discussed in the paper.

2) Under the intervention-types it is stated that interventions should be focused on improving patient outcomes. I think the authors mean here that the interventions implemented should involve direct patient care and so they have excluded interventions on hospital systems. Presumably interventions such as changes in rotas or management structure often (although not always) have as their long-term goal a focus on patient care. I would suggest the authors rephrase this criteria.

3) I also still find the wording regarding 'formal implementation data collected' unclear as an inclusion criteria, it looks from the Appendix as though the authors only included studies which were focused on asking staff about the implementation strategy (as per STARI definitions) e.g. not costs of the implementation process or fidelity to the intervention. However, in the Results e.g. p14 first paragraph, the authors discuss fidelity/attitudes to the intervention itself rather than barriers to the implementation strategy. Presumably this data should be omitted based on the inclusion/exclusion criteria.

4) In their response the authors state 'we included only studies that had a high quality of evidence regarding implementation factors' which suggests some screening for quality which is not mentioned (I think this might be an error however looking at the paper). PRISMA itself does not suggest screening out poor quality studies.
If my understanding of the inclusion/exclusion criteria is correct, I think the wording of the title of the paper and abstract (and in other places) is rather overgeneral. The authors should consider changing the framing of the paper to reflect that it is a systematic review of staff views of barriers and facilitators of implementation strategies rather than a general review of implementation barriers/facilitators.
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