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Reviewer's report:

This is generally a well written article that fits with the scope of Implementation Science and will be of particular interest to those implementing QI in this and other health care settings.

However, I think the article could provide a bit more clarity of focus for the different elements of the study throughout.

The qual data seems to be a bit of an adage and the framing in the background section doesn't seem to introduce it. So it is not clear where it fits in. This bit on stakeholder experiences of implementing the strategy seems a bit aside to the gap re fidelity identified in the background, including in relation to your own published work. So you could possibly say a bit more about how that fits into the paper. The qual data is also not much discussed in the discussion. The aims of the study are mentioned, but the authors should better consider the aims of the paper, I think. It seems to me there are two main areas 1) fidelity to EBQI and how this relates to QI 2) experiences of implementation the strategy to inform others doing it and perhaps something else about development of measures.

The title of the paper is also quite non-specific and could include something about assessing fidelity of EBQI in or process evaluation of EBQI...or something along these lines.

The data is interesting and useful I just feel that the aims and how the different pieces of work fit together could be a bit better set out and justified from the outset.
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