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Reviewer’s report:

Overall, the manuscript is improved, particularly with regard to clarity around the objectives and addition of methodological details. The topic is important, and the manuscript can be a nice contribution. However, important concerns (outlined below), remain.

* The distinction between "general healthcare setting (37% or 23/62)" in line 114 and "unspecified similar healthcare organization/setting" (line 122) is still not clear. What distinguishes a healthcare setting, which is not acute care or 'general', but is 'similar' to acute care? Maybe some examples of how the originators of the F/M/Ts that focus on 'non-specified similar healthcare organizational/settings' describe the organization and/or setting could be provided?

* The introduction now mentions that a 'modified theory analysis approach' is used (lines 127-128), but the paper could still benefit from a description of and justification for choosing this method. Further, additional detail about what the "theory analyses approach by Walker and Avant" entails might support this paragraph (lines 176-185) of the methods.

* While helpful, the new list of exclusion criteria (lines 161-166) was still somewhat hard to follow. Would a framework that includes implementation and sustainability always be excluded? Or would it be excluded only if it included implementation and sustainability without an explicit breakdown of related sustainability factors and concepts? Based on the first paragraph of the results (189-193), it seems like the later, but it could be helpful if this was explicit in the methods.

* Additional clarification for and definition of 'meaning' as a heading in line 214 may be helpful to readers.

* The review lumps research and practice together, but often F/M/Ts are better suited for one or the other. Could the authors comment on the eight identified F/M/Ts, and whether they are truly all equally suited to each?

* Lines 484-485: "Second, the new systematic review, designed to identify recently published F/M/Ts, searched only healthcare databases" How is this search method similar to/different from the initial two reviews in terms of databases searched?

* Reviewer 2 makes a very important comment: "Thus, it is unclear how strategies for sustainment differ from strategies for implementation and why different FMTs are needed". Though implementation is not a focus of this review, addressing the potential overlap between such strategies seems important.

* This paper still had a number of grammatical errors (a few examples: first sentence of the Results "Of the 2967 citations identified, eight met the inclusion criteria (e.g. 4 from Moore
et al (1), 3 from Lennox et al (10), 1 from the new systematic review) and eligible for theory analysis”)

* The additional files (particularly the two excel files) could benefit additional explanation, so they can be interpreted. For example what to the colors mean in Additional file 3?
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