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Reviewer's report:

This paper describes the methodology and the baseline sample information for a study in progress, a randomized controlled trial of IPS for veterans receiving primary care in the VA. The study is innovative in that examines IPS for a broader population than typical IPS studies. The authors give a clear rationale for the study. The description of the methodology is straightforward and clear. The same holds true for the presentation of the baseline characteristics. I have just a few minor comments.

The first sentence starting on Line 108 repeats the information starting on Line 83. The Overview of the Design starting on Line 131 may contain redundant information as well. I recommend the authors check for redundancy.

Line 263: "treatment consists mostly…” This wording is unusual for describing a study design. It may be the case that most of the control participants received a transitional work assignment or counseling from a vocational specialist, but in describing the study design, the goal is to explain what the participants were offered, not what they actually received.

Line 281: Change "Dartmouth IPS Supported Employment Center" to "the IPS Employment Center (affiliated with Westat, Inc.)."

Line 301: I would not present the revised power analysis. For one thing, it is not clear all the follow-up data were available at the time the manuscript was prepared. The numbers change, then this revised power analysis will be out of data.

Line 336: The authors should indicate when recruitment ended.

Line 397: "Southwest Asia"? I don't understand. Desert Storm was in Iraq. This must be a typo.

Line 462ff: The Discussion includes details about implementation and the challenges of working with a primary care team. This discussion is interesting and important, my question is whether this fits with the goal of this paper or belongs in a separate paper.

In the description of the sample, the mean total percent disability is 62% overall. This seems like a relatively high percentage. I encourage the author in the Discussion to reflect on this level and to give some context about the level of disability in this population. The literature provides published benchmarks on employment rates for different levels of disability.

Line 519: "principals" should be "principles."

Reference #4 (Bush 2009) is not an IPS study. I would remove.
In Table 2, the mean medical percent disability in the total sample is listed at 68.3%. This looks like a typo.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
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