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The article „Specifying and comparing implementation strategies across seven large implementation interventions: a practical application of theory" reports on proposed revisions to the ERIC taxonomy for the improvement of the applicability in real-world implementation efforts.

By reviewing qualitative data from 4 different data sources (cooperative study proposals, cooperative level documents, training documents, entries written by cooperative team members, field notes from interviews with cooperative leadership) at two different time points (year 1 and 2) of the EvidenceNOW initiative the study delivers a comprehensive picture of the strategies provided.

The authors suggest refinements in 13 strategies and propose three new strategies.

The authors suggest that their alterations would improve utility in future implementation strategies. However, as to what extent this assumption will be valid, cannot be decided.

Nevertheless, the article provides important suggestions for designing more precise implementation strategies along the ERIC taxonomy. The methodology is sound and the paper including the discussion is well written.
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