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Author's response to reviews:

Re: MS 1692936382188806: Enhanced Relapse Prevention for Bipolar Disorder: A qualitative investigation of value perceived for service users and care coordinators.

Thank you for your email of 28th August. We are delighted that the previous letter of response to the reviewers and the amended paper was well received. In light of the further comments from Michael Kauth, we have revised the paper accordingly and describe below how we have addressed the points raised.

Minor essential revisions

1. Punctuation of quotes has been amended where possible (taking into account they are presented verbatim) to make them easier to follow.

Discretionary revisions

1 and 3. It was felt by the reviewer that the length of the paper impacts its readability, and that the inclusion of some of the quotes is not necessary, particularly in the second theme of the results section (Ways of working with BD). The authors have considered this point and have omitted quote 46: CC, ERP on page 16 concerning the action plan and quote 28; CC, ERP on page 13. Many other quotes have been shortened to improve readability. It was felt that remaining quotes appropriately illustrate and reinforce the findings and are an integral contribution to the overall strength of the paper.

2. Given the purposive sampling approach taken by the study, providing frequencies of categories of comments would not be meaningful. Using a qualitative approach, comments made by a single participant should be considered just as important (i.e. carry as much weight) as those that are raised by many participants. We used the terms ‘many’ and ‘few’ to provide readers with some indication of the commonality of the issue, though not of its importance to participants. To avoid confusion for readers unfamiliar with qualitative methodologies, we have greatly limited the use of references of this kind.
We hope that the paper is now acceptable for publication and look forward to hearing from you in due course

Best wishes
Eleanor Pontin