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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. This is a clear, well-written article that describes an innovative approach to using the CFIR. I have several suggestions to hopefully strengthen the methods description and discussion section to ensure it is of interest to Implementation Science Communications readers.

Comments:

1. What study design was used?

2. What reference did you use for directed content analysis - reference? How did you do directed content analysis, specifically.

3. What reference did you use for thematic saturation? How was this determined?

4. Suggest adding more specific details to how the themes were created to the data analysis section (paragraph starting on line 170).

5. Line 485; add apostrophe to providers' (possessive)

The readers of this journal are specifically interested in studies about the implementation science, across the implementation continuum. As such, I have several suggestions to tailor the discussion to this particular audience.

6. In the results section, it is unclear how each of the 6 themes relate to the CFIR constructs. Suggest making this more explicit for the reader (perhaps in a table) before the discussion section.

7. The way the background section is written, I assume the authors are going to discuss whether SNHs have different barriers/enablers to implementation than non-SNHs. However, this is mostly only mentioned in lines 540-542. Suggest including a paragraph on this in the discussion section.

8. In the methods section, the authors described using the CFIR in a novel way ("…for collectively analyzing the implementation experiences, challenges, and facilitators, of multiple,
programmatically distinct initiatives“). I suggest speaking to the application of CFIR in this way in the methods section - strengths and challenges to this specific approach? Any weaknesses of the framework when using it this way?

9. The authors outline several recommendations at the end of the conclusion paragraph - any literature to support these specific strategies? This could be a separate "implications"-type paragraph in the discussion.
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