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**Reviewer's report:**

This is an interesting article highlighting the heterogeneity of 'expert' opinion about the most relevant strategies to address presented barriers and the difficulties stakeholders face when planning implementation efforts given the vast array of potential intervention strategies, particularly in circumstances where implementation planners may have less expertise. An average of 47 different ERIC strategies across the 39 CFIR barriers is striking, although this may have been reduced with greater knowledge of local context and underlying reasons for barriers.

The example provided in the discussion, of application of the CFIR-ERIC Implementation Strategy Matching Tool, based on a published evaluation of a telephone lifestyle coaching program (TLC) within VHA provides useful practical context. It would be interesting to know how the strategies selected by experts in the current study mapped to those actually implemented in the TLC program, by those with knowledge of local context and underlying factors, and whether this corresponded with implementation effectiveness across different sites. I.e. did experts select strategies that were actually implemented and associated with greater intervention effectiveness? Or did they endorse strategies that were less effective in practice?

An aspect I feel is missing from the current study is the lack of inclusion of implementation recipients. Obviously this is not possible when assessing theoretical barriers through a survey but it would be useful to provide guidance as to how to include the opinions of those 'on the ground' when selecting implementation strategies to address locally identified barriers.

If the purpose of a tool such as CFIR-ERIC is to simplify the implementation landscape then one wonders if finding a way to reduce the number of possible intervention strategies, by excluding those infrequently endorsed by experts, coupled with more detailed mapping of determinants, may be one way to achieve this.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this article.
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