Reviewer’s report

This is a very well-written article. The authors have done an excellent job of situating the work at the intersection of various subfields (frameworks for barriers, interventions, etc). The discussion is well-balanced, although I would have liked a little more thought of the limitations of the restricted review (versus a systematic review) in this case.

Line 136: Search syntax is specific to one of the databases. The authors should find a generic way of rephrasing this.

Line 169: For the uninitiated, it's not obvious what "agreement with the ERIC tool recommendations means" and why it's important. This could be unpacked better.

Line 178: Expert consensus will make some people think you're looking at Nominal Group exercises. I think that whatever's going on here needs unpacking for the non-expert reader.

Line 233: "This paper is the first to investigate and report barriers to implementation of the PBM guidelines." What about the systematic review published in 2018 (line 89)?

Line 254: "The absence of a reported methodological approach presents a missed opportunity to demonstrate the success of implementation attempts rigorously."

Suggest "test the effectiveness" - we should not assume success.
Line 256: "Future research should utilise available implementation methodologies to advance the science."

I find this formulation - prevalent among social scientists - troubling. It makes it sound like "advancing the science", rather than maximising population health, is the highest good. We are trying to improve people's lives and getting evidence into practice is an intermediate step. Additionally, the history of science shows us that we won't know which ideas are approximately true until epistemologically ideal conditions; we are nowhere near this state while there are multiple competing frameworks and there will be many false starts along the way.

**Level of interest**
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article of importance in its field that should be highlighted to relevant networks

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable

**Declaration of competing interests**
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?
If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal