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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
1) It is difficult to tell which of the recommendations and factor reviews were generated and reviewed only by the research group (i.e., the co-authors or expert opinion) and which were informed, generated and/or reviewed by the advisory panel - it is important to understand this distinction in the manuscript. To that end it might be helpful if there was more "methodological" information provided on how the advisory group was formed, in what way they contributed, etc. Similarly, the "methodology" around the expert opinion group - the process they used to review the literature, categorize into factors and reach consensus would be helpful.

2) There is reference to the increased funding by SAMHSA to AI/AN communities. This reviewer feels it is essential that the co-authors speak specifically to whether this is the case specifically for CSAT - given that funds for SA treatment are often provided through IHS. Is this increase to SAMHSA funding to AI/AN communities relevant to the SA treatment field, or is that increase in SAMHSA funding largely coming through CMHS?

3) The factors identified and reviewed are interesting - as are the final conclusions related to external factors. This reviewer's question, however, is how these factors (and conclusions) compare and contrast to factors in non-AI/AN .. this is mentioned in the closing paragraphs, but for this to be truly useful to the field it seems a more detail compare and contrast would be helpful.

Minor Essential Revisions
1) Finally, has anything been learned with regard to Mental Health EBP implementation that can be applied or integrated into this piece?

2) The co-authors use the terms systems, services, and treatments interchangeably. If indeed these terms are interchangeable in this context then it should be specified - if there are distinctions in meaning when those various terms are used, that would be helpful for the reader to know.
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