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Reviewer's report:

This paper is a resubmission of a paper previously submitted, and rejected, by Implementation Science in February 2019. The editor advised that he was happy to have the authors resubmit if they considered they could address the methodological issues raised by both reviewers. The authors have therefore submitted a clean new version of the paper, a tracked revision, and a detailed rebuttal table in which they address in detail the reviewers' comments.

Overall I consider that the reviewers have addressed adequately the methodological issues raised by R1 and R2. In short, the two key changes are to describe (correctly) that the review is a scoping review (using systematic methods) and the second is that the the categorization of novice/expert and ease of use has been removed from the manuscript.

Major comments:

1. While it is appropriate to remove the section on the categorization of novice/expert and ease of use given the methodological issues with this section of the original paper, its omission does weaken the originality and utility of the paper.

Minor comments


3. Search results p.11, 210-214. This reads oddly here, as it is usual to start this section by summarising figure 1. I suggest this is moved so it appears after the next section.
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