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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the fulsome response to all reviewer comments; this was really helpful. The revisions are clearly identified in the resubmission, and strengthen the narrative of the manuscript considerably, in line with reporting standards. The information provided on EBP training and coaching is really useful for understanding the context, the implementation approach, and your study. The Procedures section is a lot clearer, too. This will be very helpful to the readers.

I think this paper is in really good shape and makes important contributions to the field. Only a few minor points for revision, which will be super quick to address:

A minor stylistic point, but since you introduce the survey first, followed by fidelity to EBPs in the Procedure's section, you might maintain that order in the Measures section and other sections moving forward; up to you.

Typo on line 448 - populations is mispelled.

Lines 495 onwards - The authors write "Clearly, there is a need for theory development and testing to better understand the types of culture and climate profiles that emerge in different types of healthcare organizations..." Since this study was conducted in schools, this should also be included in a revised sentence.

Lines 515-518 - "Furthermore, these results advance causal theory in implementation science by suggesting that optimal EBP fidelity and sustainment in schools may require a comprehensive profile is one mechanism through which schools may generate optimal EBP fidelity and sustainment among their staff." You pick this up again in the Discussion. Would this not also suggest we need to figure out how to develop the organizational conditions necessary to get schools to a "comprehensive" profile? I think you get to my point in lines 587-593; thank you. I’m not sure you can posit more on what it would take to get schools to this type of profile, due to allowable space, but it is very interesting and should be explored further in future research. This question aligns nicely with Aaron's work on leadership, I think.
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