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This paper explores Intermediary/Purveyor Organizations (IPOs - organizations aimed to disseminate and distribute psychosocial interventions by promoting, providing information about, providing training in, and scaling up specific treatments) and strategies they use to disseminate and implement evidence-based psychosocial interventions (EBI's) for child mental health disorders.

Data of 127 child behavioural health EBI's and relative IPO's (119) have been analysed. An online survey has been conducted to IPO's informants to capture additional organizational information and implementation strategies used to spread EBIs.

Findings report on a number of strategies IPO's use to implement EBI's and highlight little consensus/convergence in what strategies work better.

The paper outlines approaches of great interest, which are very promising for future applications in the implementation of evidence-based practices into clinical and organizational local contexts. Hence, this work fits well with the Implementation Science's fields of interests and I recommend the acceptance of the paper after major revisions.

Rather than focus on the obvious strengths of the manuscript, which make this research a valuable work to be spread within the scientific community, I also have some comments that I describe below. I really hope that these comments will be helpful to revise the paper.

ABSTRACT

*Clearly state the "Objective" of the study in the "Background" section and link it to the presentation of results.
*Conclusion - Repetition of results in the first sentence and too much space to a "side" finding (p. 2 lines 77-80) outside the main scope of the research. In "Conclusions" I would suggest to highlight the novelty of your findings.

Introduction

*P.3 lines 103-108 and p. 4 - Is the definition of Intermediary/Purveyor Organizations (IPOs) referred to (or used mostly) a particular country - e.g. USA?

*Is the study referred to IPO's identity and strategies in USA child mental health? - If so, please address this in the title and throughout all the paper.

*P.4 and p.5 (lines 131 -133) - I think this part needs to be reworded as it looks to me just a list of attributes - if you want you can write these lists in a table but here you should be more discursive and p.5 (lines 134 -148) provide insights on previous research on IPO's and research gap.

*The same as above for the description of IPO's strategies. Moreover - is available any research on strategies for IPO's outside child mental health?

*P.5, lines 150-152: please clarify how IPOs are an example of organization who link resource systems with user systems and how the results of this study are relevant in this respect (clarify this also in the discussion). If results don't add new specific knowledge in this respect, please remove statements reporting "organization who link resource systems with user systems" as it might distract the reader if not appropriately clarified.

*I suggest to report the "research questions" p. 6, lines 161-167 as "statements" and not as "questions" and accordingly revise the subtitles in the "results" section (e.g. 2. Features and characteristics of IPOs; 3. Implementation strategies used by IPOs etc.)

METHODS

*My main concern is the small sample available (and the relative generalizability of the LCA results) and on the use of the RFD score (has been this measure validated/ tested by NREPP?)

*Throughout this section I suggest to don't point to "research questions n. 1, n. 2, etc." as the reader might find difficult to remember what the 1st, 2nd … research question are - p. 7 lines 194-195 (I would say e.g. In order to identify the spread of IPO's use…), p.10 lines 246-253.

*Any risk of bias assessment for the survey?

DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Most of discussions are "limitations" and conclusions report mainly on "results".
I would suggest to revise these sections by:

*Adding a "limitations" section

*Moving "conclusions" section's content in the "discussions" and revise this section by: limiting the reporting of "results" in this section; comparing findings of this study with previous literature (e.g. on EBI's implementation strategies); highlight the novelty and usefulness of findings for research and practice.

*In the "conclusions" section just report final remarks.
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