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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for asking me to review this paper which is well written and describes an important topic in implementation but also in the clinical context. There is a good background describing the issues facing change which is linked well with the context of the study. The nature of the health centres is well described.

I still question the appropriateness of Likert scale being described in means and standard deviations (with no description of data spread)

Minor changes

* Background - PPACA is mentioned but the country is not, this needs to be stated as well to provide the reader with the right context

* Background - I don't think (FQHCs are community health clinics that receive support from the government to provide primary care and other services to medically underserved populations.) needs to be in brackets

* Methods page 14 line 43-45 does not make sense after "…email,"

* Table 2 typo under feasibility" identify patients who are misusing N=12)or abusing prescription opioids (N=12)" a bracket is missing

* Discussion - regarding generalisability, are practitioners who work in FQHCs different to those working in other types of health centre? Given that these health centres provide care for underserved populations are they more open to risk, complex or challenging practice for example? Is SUD more prevalent in these practices than others? Is the very high proportion of female staff typical and what impact may this have on the results?

* Some lack of effect may be due to apparently high baseline scores, perhaps reflecting the centres existing positive intentions which led them to be involved in the study in the first place - it would be interesting to have carried out a "baseline" questionnaire in other centres who were not otherwise signed up to a study such as this

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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