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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. This is an interesting article that highlights the importance of evaluation implementation interventions. Although this may be of interest to Implementation Science readers, I have several suggestions to strengthen the discussion section and interpretation of study findings.

Minor Comments::
Line 138: 11% of all clinical presentations of AIS? Please clarify.
Line 140: Who's knowledge? All health care providers? Physicians specifically?
Line 154: Space between 'found significant'
Line 156: "After the end of the implementation package"... At what time point was this?

Substantive comments:  
Background

Objective 1 "Assess the validity of the staff survey measure" - provide more details.

Design and setting
-include study design in this paragraph

Discussion
Overall, the discussion lacks a clear thread that ties the study together. It is missing the "so what" of these results - what do they mean? A few suggestions:

Suggest including a paragraph in the discussion that speaks to objective #1 (assess the validity of the staff survey measure)

One of the main findings was that the TIPS intervention increased staff perceptions relating to hospital performance indicators, feedback and training. Only the feedback is discussed in the discussion section. Please expand what this means for hospital performance indicators and training.
Lines 323-327: Suggest expanding on the findings that TIPS changed the perception of nurses but not physicians. I challenge the argument that it can be challenging to change physicians' clinical practice because they are long-standing and widely held, as a very similar argument can be made for nursing practice. This is an important contextual finding that speaks to the "one size fits all" approach that is often taken during implementation - It warrants further discussion.

Discussion section - tie the discussion back to the theoretical framework that guided this work.

Implications: What are the implications for implementation scientists?
What are the next steps or future research recommendations?
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