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Author’s response to reviews:

Authors’ reply to the editor and reviewers:

Author reply: The authors thank the editor and reviewers for reviewing the manuscript again and the changes to the manuscript and are happy that they too perceive that their questions and concerns have been sufficiently addressed. We have now dealt with the few minor issues addressed by reviewer #1 which improved the manuscript.

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer #1: I appreciate the responses provided to the prior reviews and feel that my questions and concerns have been sufficiently addressed.

Author reply: Thank you for the re-review.

There are just a few minor issues to be addressed:

1) I am having some difficulty matching the information in the text and table 3. Specifically, in the results section under delivery of the intervention, paragraph 2, discussing the findings from table 3 it states "The mean score for fidelity was 94%, 91% and 94% for PE, PT and CBT, respectively." However, the mean scores for fidelity as noted on table 3 appear to be 92%, 91% and 95% for the 3 components.

Author reply: We agree. The numbers in the text have been corrected.

2) In the discussion under the subheading the evaluation of the implementation across delivery timing, intervention, components and workplaces, paragraph 2, please confirm that the sentence
(lines 10-14), "However, to fully understand why PE was less well implemented, qualitative process evaluation methods could provide valuable knowledge", is correct as the prior discussion describes difficulty with implementing PT (not PE).

Author reply: It should be PT instead of PE as the reviewer suggests. It has been corrected.

3) In the conclusion, both in the abstract and the text, there is a statement that "the intervention was delivered with a 91% success . . ." but it is not clear as to what this number reflects (i.e., what measure is considered as "success").

Author reply: The number refers to the fidelity of the delivered sessions. It has now been specified.

Thank you for this interesting work.

Reviewer #2: The authors have made substantial revisions to the manuscript to carefully address the comments provided. I have no further revisions to add.

Author reply: Thank you for the re-review.