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Reviewer's report:

*The article has merit and adds a valuable component to enhance the field's knowledge about sustainability and sustainment.
*What is a Sustainment Measurement System? The article mentions a scale/components/tool of the SMS. It is not clear overall what is the relationship of the scale/component to the whole system. Use one term and stick to it for consistency or explain each word to avoid confusion.
*While pointing gaps in the existing tools, a few lines are devoted to listing the current tools, but no specific details are provided as to how those instruments are lacking and how the new instrument covers those gaps. Consider adding particular item details to demonstrate how gaps exist. Are other tools cited valid and reliable?
*The article did not give the definitions of sustainability determinants, outcomes, and global sustainment. Are sustainability elements the same as sustainability determinants?
*The article refers to an "earlier study," but that reference needs to be condensed in a few sentences so the reader can understand the context.
*Spell out NIDA on page 6.
*Consider providing definitions and citations for convergent and discriminant validity.
*Consider using the more inclusive term "substance use" rather than substance abuse.
*The article is missing the tables (table # 1-6), which limits the reviewer's ability to provide comprehensive feedback.
*Consider providing an introduction to the tool with sub-sections and item examples.
*This sentence below is confusing and appears only in conclusion. This finding needs to be elaborated for clarity.
  "Second, the SMSS can be used validly and reliably across this broad array of programs, practices and initiatives with varying levels of evidence to support their effectiveness. This enable us to determine whether the extent to which a program or practice is evidence-based or evidence informed determines whether it can be sustained."
*Some instruments are mentioned for comparison throughout the paper, but readers are not oriented towards them, for example, Stages of Implementation. The author is assuming that readers have this knowledge but need to explain the tools in a few sentences.
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