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Reviewer’s report:

The present study investigated the implementation of cascade training for suicide prevention in Scotland. The identified factors included some components specific to suicide prevention rather than other healthcare topics. Revisions would be recommended to increase the relevance of results to suicide prevention, especially in Background and Discussion section.

1. Title: The term 'evaluation' may be misleading, otherwise this study well described the facilitators and barriers of implementation of cascade training. 'An evaluation of implementation of'?

2. Abstract: Results emphasized multi-layered activity of constructing coherence of the intervention. I agree with that, however, its relevance to cascade training approach may be lacked in current version. Some descriptions, such as 'dilution of the quality of the training', would be inserted into Results.

3. Background: The section starts with cascade training (page 4 line 2-) which is followed by suicide prevention (page 6 line 20-). This order may be uncommon, but suitable for the manuscript. The rationales of cascade training approach for suicide prevention would be added to the latter. WHO report on suicide prevention (2014) may be reference supporting the view of public health and primary care rather than specialist care for suicidality.

4. Results: Categories (sub-headings) are a bit difficult for understanding the contents, though narratives are well allocated and interpreted. Would these be renamed?

5. Discussion: The multi-layered activity of constructing coherence of the intervention is identified as crucial to the implementation (page 17 line 44-). Does it come from characteristics of 'cascade training approach' or 'suicide prevention'? The multi-layered activity seems to be indicated as key of implementation process of psychosocial interventions in several healthcare areas.

6. Discussion: Little systematic evidence of reflexive monitoring may be core difficulty in suicide prevention and further discussed (page 18 line 17-). Evaluation/outcome monitoring is important for motivating healthcare professionals to implement the intervention. However, the effectiveness of suicide prevention activities is usually hard to capture; i.e. change in suicide rates or attempts.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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