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This is a well conceptualized and important paper that examines the relationship between organizational climate/culture and clinical attitudes towards evidence-based programs. The study is based on a large, population-based sample of 100 mental health service institutions, and two-level hierarchical modeling is used to assess the relative importance of culture and climate to the EBPAS scale. The measures that are used are becoming the standards in the field of implementation science, so the work is relevant for both the theory and practice of implementation science.

The beginning of the paper provides a comprehensive presentation of the dimensions and subdimensions of both EBPAS and organizational culture and climate. This is followed by a two-level analysis that uses clinician characteristics and culture and climate to predict total EBPAS score, then these analyses are replicated using the four subdimensions of EBPAS.

**Major Revisions**

1. The authors also describe the 16 first order scales and 7 second order scales for OSC but do not report correlations among the first order scales. The full correlation matrix would be important to provide.

2. Because the same clinicians respond the organizational context measures as EBPAS, it seems quite reasonable to ask whether the contextual culture and climate data provide any additional explanation beyond the individual ratings of these same measures. It may be that the effects of culture and climate are individually driven, not by contextual relations. Thus an analysis that distinguishes individual versus contextual cultural and climate effects would be important to include.

**Minor revisions:**

1. Layout of the tables for analyses can be improved. In particular, the analyses of categorical variables with a reference group should include an overall test for significant differences, rather than be limited to these specific contrasts.

2. There should also be some additional comment regarding the percent of organizational variance explained: 96% of Divergence is explained, but only 2% of the variability is due to organizational factors.
3. One analysis should examine whether the response rate in clinics, which vary from a low of 30%, are related to the outcomes.
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