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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review "A mixed-methods study of system-level sustainability of evidence-based practices following 12 large-scale implementation initiatives" for the Journal of Health Research Policy and Systems. This manuscript is organized and articulate. Moreover, the research questions addressed are key to increasing understanding of successful implementation and factors affecting sustainment of practice. I have highlighted several areas for revision by the authors:

1) Ln 45 - The language "negative child outcomes" seems too specific in this sentence since the paper’s patient/intervention focus hasn’t been introduced yet. Please rephrase and broaden this sentence.

2) Please include in the participant description, the number of people involved in initiatives who were contacted but declined participation.

3) Please briefly describe how the respondents were selected for the sustainment survey?

4) Given the wide range of time since initial implementation across these initiatives, interpretation of some data may be more relevant when considering time since implementation (e.g., Barriers such as openness). Was this included as a variable in the regression analyses?

5) Were survey respondents themselves the identified PCIT champions in some cases? If so, this should be noted and implications discussed.

6) Appeal was identified as a barrier by the majority of initiatives, however, there are no examples given of low appeal or areas of concern. Please include such examples.

7) The Integration into practice section describes efforts to extend PCIT to new settings and populations. This extension of programming to new populations and settings is novel and encouraging and should be highlighted in the discussion.

8) Please include in the discussion of Interviewer/Initiative differences in ratings potential biases as well.
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