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General remarks:
This study investigates whether it is feasible to implement a psychoeducational group program in a community mental health setting. It is focused on the methodology of introducing such a treatment, and the process of implementation, not on the results of the treatment itself. The study procedure consisted of a training program and two psychoeducational groups. It describes the barriers and drivers of the process. It is a small study including two groups of respectively 9 and 10 patients.

Please number your comments and divide them into
- Major Compulsory Revisions

(1) In general, the report is too long and at some points too anecdotal for such a small study. This could be a rather brief report describing the methodology and the outcome of the training program and the two groups. Although the detailed description of the process and the quotes are interesting, they do not really add to the value of the report. All the relevant information is given in the tables and should not be doubled in the text.

(2) The method of triangulation which is essential to the study should be explained in more detail, for not all readers will be familiar with it.

(3) The conclusion of the study that “group PE involving CMHT and EP facilitators is acceptable and feasible” is somewhat surprising since the number of barriers is much larger than the number of drivers, and the fact that the treatment was not continued and implemented after the two groups had finished. The paper gives the impression that the study was ended prematurely mainly for financial reasons, which may be essential for the implementation in clinical practice.

(4) The study is strongly linked to the health care system in Great Britain. In the discussion it could be more generalized.

(5) In the results section of the abstract the main findings should be summarized.

- Minor Essential Revisions
(6) Description of the training process and its participants and that of the two psychoeducational groups could be more separated.

(7) The initials used in the manuscript do not fully correspond to the list of authors.

(8) The authors information only refers to one author (RM).

- Discretionary Revisions
  None

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests