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Reviewer’s report:

Much has been improved in the manuscript. However, some issues are still present and some new ones were introduced as I will explain below.

Major revisions:
- Appendix 1: Is it correct that the incremental probability to be active (ERS vs usual care, p=0.048) does not equal 0.336 (probability after ERS) – 0.297 (probability after usual care)?
- Discussion, third paragraph: please explain (shortly) which non-health outcomes were considered and how these outcomes were obtained and valued.

Minor revisions:
- Introduction, third paragraph: the last sentence seems to be incomplete “as they a diagnosed condition”.
- Discussion, fifth paragraph: I think it should read that decision analytic models may not well be suited to interventions aimed at complex behavioural interventions and not the other way around.
- Figure 2: add explanation for the radiate (which threshold does it represent?).

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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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