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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. It is good to see implementation work occurring in schools, and I believe this study provides new knowledge for the IS field generally. I will suggest a few areas where revisions would strengthen the paper.

Line 175: It appears that the use of the proper plural for curriculum; curricula, is warranted in this sentence.

Method; Lines 186 onward: The authors state that "teachers and classroom staff received training in three EBPs..." Was this training done in this study? Because training approaches have important implications for EBP implementation it is important to describe the training and (hopefully) the related coaching support for these teachers, relative to these EBPs. Also some notion of what they had been providing to students prior would be important. Where all teachers/classrooms trained in all 3 EBPs? If so, how are they integrated in the classroom and when are they used? How do they differ? What are the implications of teachers learning 3 EBPs at the same time?

It would also be important to describe more about how the schools were recruited, and how/why they decided to participate. Participation in research studies of this type are often 'decided' upon by leadership, even though the teachers are the ones who are being asked to change their practices. In other words, was there buy in for change at all levels? What work was done to prepare the organizational conditions for practice change within these schools, prior to training?

Method; Lines 208 onwards: with what frequency was fidelity rated in each classroom, over what period of time? What are the psychometric properties of the fidelity measures used for these EBPs? Why only rate two observations, and why for 15 minutes each time? What's the likelihood of observing the 3 EBPs during this span of time? It might be expected that the more rigid environments took more time to get to the EBP components within the curriculum, no?

Since the focus is on teacher practice change, why only report aggregatee teacher fidelity data by school? How did teachers' fidelity change over time, or did you not look at that?

Results, p.12 onwards: In order to understand the results, the reader must know more about the training approach, the selection method (for schools and for teachers). The paper would benefit from adherence to StaRI or other implementation reporting guidelines, to ensure that the
necessary information is shared with the reader (i.e., pertaining to both the EBPs and the implementation methods); see Equator Network.

Post Hoc analyses: Several other variables may account for your findings, based on CFIR, for instance, including characteristics of the teacher, training method, school environment (competing initiatives), training method/coaching provided or not (train and hope approach?). These should be acknowledged in your limitations section.

Discussion, p. 16 onwards: I believe the word 'outcomes' is missing at the end of your sentence on line 387.

I greatly appreciate how challenging it is to provide the requisite detail (as per reporting guidelines) for journal manuscripts that do not allow the space to do so and/or do not request use of reporting guidelines (this is a bigger publishing issue, of course). Perhaps you might add some details in additional files?
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