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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this interesting paper. Please find my comments below:

There is some inconsistency in terminology used. For example, critical challenges vs barriers. If using critical challenges best to be consistent throughout and also define exactly what is meant by this term for the purposes of this paper.

When discussing prior research on facilitators in the background section, it may be useful to consider if some of these are actually better framed as interventions e.g. decision support systems.

The authors provide a very clear and convincing justification for why it is important to explore implementation efforts in this setting specifically (safety net hospitals).

It would have been useful to have a more detailed description of the SNH under study.

Clear justification for using CFIR as a theoretical framework and interesting and well positioned reflections on use of CFIR for collectively analysing implementation efforts across multiple initiatives.

Structure and presentation of information in the methods section could be improved. For example, breaking down data collection and analysis into two separate sub-headings. Further justification for the use of content analysis (plus references to support it) would have been useful in the methods section.

Very good reliability checks built into the analysis approach (e.g. all transcripts double coded and regular meetings to discuss and define problematic constructs).

The information on ethics and standards for reporting qualitative research is oddly positioned at the end of the methods and may benefit from a separate sub-heading(s).

Clear definitions provided for each of the participant groups that were included in the study (implementation oversight, implementation champion and frontline implementation).

It would have been useful to know exactly how many priority initiatives were identified. Were there six in total across the five settings?
The biggest issue with this article is the misalignment between information presented in the methods, results and discussion sections. This may be an issue of presentation but it certainly requires attention. The methods state that a content analysis has been conducted using CFIR. However, the themes presented in the results are not explicitly linked to CFIR in any way. They are also not broken down into barriers/critical challenges and facilitators which is what I was expecting in line with the research aims. The discussion then identifies five facilitators and three barriers which does not align with the six core themes identified in the results section. The discussion proceeds to map the findings to CFIR which I would have expected to see in the results section in align with the content analysis approach explained in the methods. I am left unclear on exactly what form the analysis took and why it was thought useful to present the findings in different ways across the results and discussion sections. This is a shame as the findings are extremely interesting and it does seem that a thorough and reflective analysis has been conducted. It is particularly interesting when the authors identify examples of where the findings are and are not specific to SNHs.

It would be useful to number the quotations included in the results according to the participant that they came from. At the moment it is quite difficult to tell how many of the participants are represented in the results (although roles are clearly stated).

It would be interesting to further explore any key differences between the three participant groups. It may also be worth breaking the themes down into lower level themes as they currently cover multiple key points. Quotations could also be included throughout the researcher commentary as opposed to at the end of the section (which is where they are most frequently presented currently). Sometimes it is difficult to tell exactly which point from the researcher commentary each quotation is supporting.

The authors thoroughly consider the strengths and limitations of the study.

It would have been interesting to separate out the recommendations/implication for practice from the broader conclusion (which again feels misaligned with the results section in the way that the findings are presented).
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