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Author’s response to reviews:

Below, we outline our edits in response to the editor’s comments.

1. The measures of feasibility are not clearly outlined. How was feasibility measured and how did you use this measure to determine that training is feasible? In the methods, you state that feasibility questions were asked, but no further details are provided.

   Thank you for your comments. You correctly state that we did not measure feasibility; we conceptualized it more as a process (“can this work?”) and less as an implementation outcome. We have edited the results section to reflect this.

2. Thank you for highlighting the equal priorities of the qualitative and quantitative components of this study. As a mixed methods study, it would be helpful to include this in the title and describe the qualitative and quantitative components separately. Some guidance on reporting mixed methods studies can be found here: https://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/guidelines-for-conducting-and-reporting-mixed-research-in-the-field-of-counseling-and-beyond/

   Thank you for your guidance. We have added the sentences below to outline the separate goals of the quantitative and qualitative methods:
Quantitative and qualitative data were collected simultaneously, giving equal weight to both types of data (QUAN+QUAL)(44), using the qualitative data to complement the quantitative data to provide deeper understanding of the students’ perspective. We used quantitative measures to examine students’ knowledge gain, the acceptability and usability of the BL platform, and to evaluate the teaching process and the fidelity of the teaching process. The qualitative phase aimed to explore the students’ experiences with the course. The two processes were used to provide significant enhancement of the results (45).

3. Please revise the abstract for clarity. It is hard to find a link between the first two sentences in the background. It is unclear how Blended Learning would resolve the issues raised and GenerationPMTO is mentioned without prior reference. Feasibility measures should also be addressed here. Instead of saying:"Results supported the feasibility, acceptability, and usability of BL training.", report the actual measures that indicate that this is true. Please do the same for this sentence as well:" Results also indicate high fidelity scores at the instructors’ level."

We very much appreciate your recommendation and have edited the abstract as well as the results sections. We have also edited the manuscript sections in the hopes that it will increase clarity or our study.

The title mentions parent interventionists but this doesn't seem obvious that the training is targeting a parent intervention.

We have changed the title to: Teaching GenerationPMTO, an Evidence-based Parent Intervention, in a University Setting Using a Blended Learning Strategy

4. Please use this document for further guidance on feasibility studies: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20053272

Thank you for the reference. It was useful.