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Reviewer's report:

Overall, the authors have done a nice job addressing the comments. The main focus of the manuscript has been clarified, and the measurement section has been expanded. Table 3 and the Lessons Learned section are valuable additions to the manuscript.

There are three minor essential revisions on this version to be addressed.

First, the manuscript needs to be tightened, especially in the Background section. The authors have appropriately incorporated the literature (including Weiner et al.), however, now there is too much detail. The manuscript includes very detailed summaries of other research (Weiner and also the article by Helfrich and colleagues) and the detail takes away from the goals of this manuscript. This section can be substantially streamlined by highlighting the literature and the relevance to the project and then moving on to the goals of this paper. Also, there is some repetition in the Methods section.

A few specific examples:
• The first three paragraphs of the Background section (pp 4-5) could be condensed to one paragraph.
• Page 6, starting on line 4: The two sentences can be removed – “This measure was mentioned…… of the ORCA [14]” especially because the Helfrich article is mentioned on the next page.
• Methods: page 10, the information in the second paragraph of the Methods section is repeated (almost exactly in a few places) on page 11 under the Measures section.

Second: The sample size is still not clear. Based on the Methods section, there are nine sites with complete baseline data. How many sites have follow-up data? Table 3 shows that one site is missing at 1 month but picked up again 3 months which would keep 9 sites. Then, Table 4 shows only 8 sites for all Context Scale items. Is one site missing on all items (and essentially dropped) or do different sites fall out for items based on missing data? If one site is missing, then the sample size is 8. If the N varies to missing data across sites, then it should be noted in a table footnote.

Finally, Table 3 is a nice addition to the manuscript. More detailed information
about the column labels is needed by renaming the labels and/or adding more information as a footnote (i.e. Complexity Level (1A, 1B etc), Intakes, Total Patient Census (treated?) are not defined on Table).
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