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Reviewer's report:

This paper delivers on its stated aims and scores highly on rigour, fidelity and proportionality of claims. In this regard, I can't fault it. I see that it has been through a previous round of review comments and therefore am assuming that the scope and contribution are deemed appropriate for the journal.

I do have a few additional points that I can't resist making about the paper and the boundaries set around the task reported in it.

The first relates to the decision to confine the trawl of theory to behavioural psychology. I appreciate that not all disciplines can be covered but I wondered whether a more fruitful search might have taken in, for example, organisational science or selected other disciplines with something to say about the drivers of behaviour in (health care) organisations. It felt strange to be deep into the paper and reading about the limits of Skinner and operant learning. Perhaps a small revision might be to strengthen the sections where this choice is explained/considered.

I would also have liked to have seen some consideration given, at least at a speculative level, to why any given theory might be more or less appropriate for understanding behaviour change in each direction. E.g. the concept of 'loss aversion' (Kahneman etc) might logically have greater salience in a context of decreasing rather than increasing activity.

I wondered why the decision was taken to build a normative component into the definitions of implementation and de-implementation (i.e. in each case the term is understood as linked to the strength of evidence for a change in practice). It seems to me that 'bad' changes might be interesting to study alongside 'good' changes.

These comments apart, this is clearly a robust and accomplished paper within its own terms and I accept that reviewers shouldn't expect papers to reflect their own interests and preoccupations!
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