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Reviewer's report:

This paper presents qualitative and quantitative data from an investigation of perceived barriers and facilitators to the implementation of iCBT in the Canadian mental health care system. The topic is important and the use of the CFIR model to guide the investigation is a strength. However, my two major concerns are that the manuscript is overly detailed in some places and needs better organization to follow; and that the sample size is very small for some of these analyses to be appropriate, making interpretation of them questionable. Below I describe my concerns as they appear in the manuscript:

1. The Introduction is interesting and generally well-written, but ends very abruptly. A few sentences are needed at the end foreshadowing what actually happened in the study. At present the aims read as vague and more concrete information is needed.

2. The Context and Setting section is long and could be better organized if broken up into sub-sections.

3. The sample size is acceptable for the qualitative analyses but very small for the quantitative analyses. Anything beyond descriptive statistics (e.g., t-tests comparing managers to therapists) should be eliminated from the manuscript for the quantitative survey findings.

4. When describing the survey, the authors should give some examples of the CFIR domains assessed, and an example of what a question would be to tap into that domain. Also, what were some examples of the open-ended questions? More is needed on the description of the measure itself.

5. It would be clearer to have separate qualitative and quantitative subsections for each CFIR heading in the Results.

6. The two biggest limitations of the study were the use of qualitative analyses and a very small sample size, yet neither of these limitations were discussed. Although good arguments can be made for qualitative analyses, they should be tempered by a discussion of the limitations. Similarly, it is understandable that the N would be small for a study like this, but a discussion of the implications of this limited sample size need to be addressed.
7. The Discussion is very long. The first half, which summarizes the Results, can be cut down significantly.

8. Table 3 is far too detailed to be useful as a table. The authors should simplify.
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
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