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Reviewer's report:

General

The context of the trial within the mental health workers is now clear. The intention to treat analysis as it was done makes some strong assumptions. See comments below.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

The wording on top of p7 needs editing: first line; replace 'there would be' with 'that'. Fourth line- delete 'we would identify'

The wording on the bottom of page 13. Replace 'significant' with 'significantly different'.

Page 15. Lost to follow-up. In the results and Figure 1 the number lost to follow up is 4. 100*4/40=10% and not 8% as repered on page 15.

If one compares the lost to follow-up between the two arms 31% vs 10% this is significantly different p=.0189. It thus seems that one benefit of the intervention is improving the retention of staff if one assumes that lost to follow-up is equivalent to leaving the health service. One notice that the 12 workers in the control arm had a very low Maslach depersonalisation score when compared to the group who remained 4.50 vs 8.64. The missing completely at random (MCAR) approach that was followed by analysing only the complete data is therefor somewhat in doubt.

(For a good reference on this topic see Missing Data in Clinical Studies from Molenberghs and Kenward Wiley 2007).

The ordering of the measures for Table 4 should correspond with that of Table 3. The description of the measures should be the same for Tables 3 and 4. i.e.
Knowledge ...

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

**What next?:** Accept after minor essential revisions

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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