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Reviewer's report:

The authors have clearly done a significant amount of work to respond to the reviewer comments and the article is greatly improved as a result. I am satisfied that my comments have been addressed although have a few final follow up suggestions below:

1. The data analysis section is greatly improved but I think some further detail is required to explain which components of the analysis were deductive (i.e. theory driven) and which were inductive (i.e. data driven). I am unclear what is meant by "reviewed and wrote descriptive summaries of data coded to each CFIR construct". Was this inductive thematic analysis within each of the deductively applied CFIR categories? If so, how exactly did the construct and domain summaries inform this process and in which order were the steps completed in? Some further clarification would be helpful here.

2. The presentation of material in the discussion section could also be further improved. I would suggest starting the discussion with a clear summary of the CFIR domains that were found to be relevant and the barriers and facilitators identified within them (similar to what you have included at the start of the results). The information that follows on the feasibility of CFIR application in this context would be better presented later in the discussion as opposed to where you are summarising the key findings. At the start of the sub-section on barriers, I would suggest that you provide a brief summary of themes and CFIR domains in the way that you have done for the sub-section on facilitators.
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