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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for submitting this paper on a topical and pertinent topic. Overall, I found the paper interesting and well-written, with some very thought provoking results. In particular, the issues around mental health professionals using more technical language and tending to set the agenda, allied with the role of the moderators is well considered and I agree with the suggestion for a re-consideration of how the moderation is operationalised. My main concerns are as follows:

Major Compulsory Revisions.

1. Ethics: There is no mention of ethical approval having been obtained for this study or the obtaining of informed consent by participants.

2. Methodology: There is no description of the discourse analysis employed or how used in this particular study.

3. Results: As the methods of analysis have not been described in detail, the reader is unclear as to how the sub'headings or 'themes' in the results have been identified.

Minor Essential Revisions.

4. Abstract: Conclusions - an intervention can not have a goal. This requires rephrasing.

Discretionary Revisions.

5. As a reader I would have liked to have seen more triangulation with other methods (e.g. interviews with participants). If this is available, then perhaps there could be more mention of this in the discussion.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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