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Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting paper in a rapidly expanding field of study. One important aim of the paper is to validate an existing instrument in an education context. This is timely, as there is a growing need to extend implementation science into the area of education.

However, I am not convinced that that authors have gone far enough to be able to transfer the concepts directly into school situations and this is acknowledged in the limitations section, when the authors suggest that 'Data were only gathered from embedded behavioural health consultants' and that 'Data gathered from multiple providers within each of the schools and aggregated to reflect the OIC factors at the school level might have produced somewhat different results'. I agree with this.

The second aim of the paper, to validate the instrument, has been carried out very carefully and with technical accuracy. The model is really useful and with more extended preparation for use in schools the scales could be used as tools for surveying the conditions of the school before, or after implementation of EBP programmes.

The paper would benefit from a much more extensive education focussed literature section. Deeper reading and more extended definitions would enhance the work and prevent the duplication which takes place in the introduction. For example, there are lots of examples of EBP interventions taking place in schools and although school improvement may not be conceptualised in the EPIS terms the authors use in the paper, there are many published examples of school development but where different terms are used for the same concepts. This is an inherent difficulty when moving across disciplines.

I have a problem with the 'behaviourist' views of teaching that the authors use and would challenge the assertions made in this paragraph in p10, that 'In the education sector, existing measures of organizational processes have several limitations: (1) they are most often either global/molar in nature (rather than specific to implementation) or intended for use with specific EBPs and not generalizable; (2) they lack an underlying theoretical framework'. I think the authors could look more closely at the Education literature and perhaps adopt a more critical approach to some of the assertions they make in the paper.

In the next draft, the authors ought to address the inconsistencies in referencing, for example there is a citation on p7 which uses APA guidelines and reference 18 is incomplete in the
reference list. It would be helpful too if some of the jargon used could be explained more fully for readers not familiar with terms such as 'micro', 'molar', 'global' and 'embedded mechanisms.' The extended inclusion of examples in brackets in the text is also quite clunky and makes the text more awkward to read.

The paper has many merits but needs a little more work before it is really useful for education researchers.
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