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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
Narrow the focus of the paper and aims of the study to those reported in the manuscript.
Edit the manuscript, particularly the health economics.
Method in the results and vice versa.
Manuscript is too descriptive of process.
Further justify the becks as primary outcome measure.
Focus the background, seems to suggest previous research in this area ineffective?
Clarify the purpose of the paper is this reporting the trial, health economics or both - in which case seems unbalanced.

Minor Essential Revisions
Further emphasis of poor power, and particularly retaining service users in the study.
Not sure the comparison of patient-related factors needed if this is a randomised study.
Style of writing ie. 'the report goes on to argue' at times feels wordy.

Discretionary Revisions
Nothing much on UCLA loneliness scale.
Consistency of line spacing

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

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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