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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?

The question is interesting and the authors have made the specific contributions of their work much clearer.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?

The authors have clarified the specific questions being addressed. The specification of one of the sites as "Beginner" was confusing because it lead me to believe that the two sites were fundamentally hard to compare but the fact that the second site was not really a "Beginner" is now clear. I still find the label confusing as this site was not really a beginner but an unsuccessful implementer. As such, the comparison of the two sites is justified and the conclusions drawn are richer.

3. Are the data sound and controlled?

Acceptable

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

Yes. The conclusions, discussions and limitations are very well framed at this point.

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

Acceptable

7. Is the writing acceptable?

Yes

Major compulsory revisions
The labeling of the second site as "beginner" is, I feel, misleading. The authors have clarified the fact that the second site is not a beginner but has been attempting to implement EBP for 3 or more years. This makes the comparison of the two sites very reasonable.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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