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Reviewer's report:

This is well written, nicely described manuscript, which helps fill an important gap in implementation science. Describing how user-centered design (UCD) can contribute to implementation science efforts, and in particular how IS and UCD experts may work together (i.e., IS researchers don't necessarily need to become experts in UCD, but can partner), should be a nice contribution to the field. However, several mentions are made to future work, which could be accomplished with the existing data (e.g., follow-up survey and go-zones), this paper would be strengthened in describing partnerships by including those findings. For example, page 18, lines 21-26 indicates "Our efforts will be informed by analysis of the rank-order and qualitative feedback we collected from participants in this study about challenges and desired supports for cross-discipline collaboration.", but related findings are not include in the results. Perhaps the current paper could either be augmented with these additional results or framed more as preliminary findings with future direction clearly laid out? A few other notes are included below:

* Throughout the paper, it would be helpful to clarify whether the efforts are around using UCD for innovation/evidence-based intervention development, implementation strategy development, or both. It seems that this would apply to both (e.g., first sentence of the discussion), but this does not come through consistently.

* Looking at the study protocol, the number of UCD participants was considerably lower than the target (22 of 30); could the authors comment on how this may impact the robustness and generalizability of the findings (even if the actual sample size is greater than the number needed for analysis)? The paper does not seem to discuss limitations, but this seems important to consider, particularly given the findings among UCD experts, which remain un-explained.

* The alternate clusters identified among UCD expert responses are very interesting, and may be able to provide additional depth. Would it be possible to discuss the findings with UCD experts to gain insight into the meaning of these alternate clusters? Perhaps this could be noted as a future research direction or limitation, as re-engaging with stakeholders to interpret the concept map can be a part of concept mapping? For example, on page 17, lines 24-39: greater involvement from UCD experts might address some of the unanswered questions raised?

* The manuscript describes a third consideration of the cluster map based on i-PARIHS, but does not describe how and why this model was selected or used, which seems
particularly notable given the detailed description of how and why CFIR was selected and applied.

* Page 17, lines 9-17: Looking at the Witteman et al review, it does not seem the UCD framework mentioned has a name ("These clusters were consistent with a separate framework for UCD [17] which proposes a cyclical process …"), but might it help IS readers engage more deeply with the UCD literature to also site some of the UCD references referenced by Witteman et al? Perhaps this could help IS researchers learn more about UCD concepts?

* Very minor: Should Page 4, line 48: "In the present study, we sought characterize" be "In the present study, we sought to characterize"?

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

An article of importance in its field

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 organisation 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