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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors:

Thank you for your comprehensive response to the reviews. I appreciated the amalgamation of both reviewers' feedback with the responses together.

It is my perspective that the areas that you have enhanced around the theory, etc., make the protocol much clearer for the reader.

I have some small points for you to consider fixing and this is from the non-track change version:

Line 67, there is a reference to 8c, which I believe is a typo.

For your coding etc, this is not essential to add and you likely already have it, but do you see a place for https://implementationscience.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13012-017-0605-9 in your referencing of your approach?

Lines 93-96 - I don't think you need to list the CFIR domains as the TDF domains are not listed.

Line 114 Oxford comma would help after the word "design"

Line 133- underline "I" of inclusion?

Line 147 - add "the" before "TDF and CFIR"

Lines 189 - 191 - would you consider moving the definition of effective strategies to context as it seems to fit with the other definitions versus leaving it in outcomes?

Line 284 - should this be 33-35 not 33, 35?

Line 297 TDF domain name starting with "beliefs" does not require capitalization
Minor comment about policy maker vs decision maker. Lines 117 - decision-maker is used and in line 383 "policymaker" used. I suggest choosing one (or both depending on how you define it) to be consistent in both places.

Line 442 - space after KJM

References - check formatting (e.g., refs 8, 20 appear to have different reference formatting).

I look forward to the results of your review.
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