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This manuscript offers preliminary analysis and guidance on de-implementation outcomes, including how they may differ from or overlap with implementation outcomes. The authors also discuss how these outcomes may be operationalized and measured, how they could be measured in different setting such as clinical care vs. community programs. They use Proctor and colleague's taxonomy of implementation outcomes as their basis for comparison.

This is a very well-written article with significant importance to the field of Implementation Science. As the authors point out, the concept of de-implementation is becoming increasingly prevalent in the literature. This submission provides one of the first and only discussions around how to conceptualize and operationalize de-implementation.

A small revision or perhaps a follow-up report would be useful so that the authors may provide additional information on the 'degree' or 'extent' of the outcomes. For example, if the same definition for acceptability is used for de-implementation, the focus should be on how unacceptable the practice is -- it would be helpful to understand the degree of unacceptability and whether a certain threshold should be considered in order for a practice to be deemed 'unacceptable.' Similarly, when conceptualizing appropriateness, thinking about the element of time may be important. That is, if a stakeholder or provider perceives a practice to not fit or have relevance, should a certain period of time elapse before the practice is deemed inappropriate?
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