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This study reports on the relationship between teacher attitudes and organizational factors in the delivery of EBPs for children with ASD in public schools. I found the study to be a bit challenging to follow due to some unconventional sentence structures and a lack of information about various aspects of the study and the larger context. The findings are of some interest but mostly to schools and perhaps even more specifically to teachers and classrooms delivering EBPs, which the authors themselves note are somewhat unique. Given the limitations of the study and the focus, the findings are a modest contribution to the field of implementation science and this study might be better suited to an outlet focused on schools or services for children with ASD. My comments below are in the order in which they appear in the manuscript. I hope the authors find them helpful.

Abstract. Based on your study aims and findings it seems more appropriate to change this "school staff vary in their implementation of autism evidence-based practices (EBPs)" to simply be "but implementation of evidence-based practices (EBPs) for autism vary." Either way, the phrasing "autism evidence-based practices (EBPs)" needs to be changed.

If you introduce the EBP acronym in the Abstract, then be sure to use it thereafter (it appears multiple times in the Abstract all spelled out).

Background. Missing parenthesis after "mental health providers" on page 5.

Current Study section on page 7 has a number of redundancies with the preceding paragraph. Please remove reference to "this study" in the preceding paragraph and focus on Background more generally.

Seems that a reference for the term "EBP fatigue" is needed on page 7 as this is not a common concept.
Participants section (page 8). It seems that this study was conducted in both Washington and Pennsylvania, correct? If so, the teachers, schools, classrooms, etc. also need to be broken down by state as this is an important level to consider. This should also be considered in the analytic plan but the small sample size could make it challenging to fully explore.

One page 9, the authors state, "Ongoing training was provided to teachers and classroom staff in three EBPs (DTT, PRT, VS) for children with autism [44]." This makes it sound like the current study was conducted within a larger project. This needs to be clearly stated and additional information about the parent study needs to be provided in the Background. In fact, this entire paragraph should probably be in the Background with additional information to contextualize the parent study and how the current study fits in.

Page 9. What does it mean, "Following Pellecchia and colleagues" does this mean using their method or were their results used (this assumes the same trial for this paper and their study but this isn't clear to the reader).

Page 11. Reliabilities and other psychometrics for this study need to be presented for the ICS and ILS. [I see now that ICCs are presented for these scales in the Data Analysis section - they need to be moved to the measures section as establishing their reliability etc. was not a central aim of the study].

Page 12. The Sensitivity Analysis section seems unnecessary. Is there a reason this is included?

Regression analyses and reporting of the results are well done. One question, to improve measurement properties, was a composite measure considered for the three EBPs? This seems appropriate given that it could be argued that they are non-independent and analysis of them individually has the potential to inflate Type I error (thus, a Bonferroni correction or similar would need to be used).
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