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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review.

It is important to note once again that this study represents a massive accomplishment. Ambitious implementation studies that compare different strategies for implementation are needed. In that respect this offers an example for future work.

Some minor concerns to be addressed:

1) If ACT was collected at baseline, I don't follow how it is listed as a secondary 'outcome'. I guess if only measured at baseline it should be reported much earlier in the results section...

2) Typically, ICCs are higher for process measures than for more distal outcomes. Process measures in primary care often have an ICC of 0.1 and outcome measures more like the stated 0.01. I appreciate the additions made in regard to ICCs - I might suggest that a revised sample size calculation could be helpful for readers...

3) If ACT was similar across sites, how do we understand differences observed across countries and sites? Maybe ACT doesn't capture contextual factors relevant to improvement in these processes or relevant to responsiveness to the intervention?
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