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Reviewer’s report:

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

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.

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).

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").

Thank you for this interesting work.
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