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Reviewer's report:

Review of "A pilot feasibility randomised controlled trial of an adjunct brief social network intervention in opiate substitution treatment services in England"

General: The aims of this review is to test the feasibility of recruiting patients engaged in drug treatment services for at least a year, to test the feasibility of training of NHS clinicians, to test whether B-SBNT reduces heroin use 3 and 12 months after treatment, and to test the feasibility of measuring changes in the health and functioning of family or networks member.

This is an impressive piece of work and generally, the quality of this work seems to be good. I am questioning the reporting of outcomes and the structure of the reporting. Furthermore the results connected to the fourth aim seems to be missing?

Method:

Assessment and Trial Outcome analysis: It is difficult to figure out the measures and the outcomes. Please make it more clear what all the outcomes (describe them all) are and how were these measured? You should also in the abstract short describe the primary and secondary outcomes.

Sample size: on page 10: "If the proportion of patients that stopped taking heroin in the B-SBNT group was 0.3 we could then produce an approximate 95% confidence interval of 0.18 - 0.44 for this estimate". What is the 0.3? Hedges g? Cohens d?, or what? How do you calculated that this confidence interval?

Why did you not describe the analyses more in details? The analysis is very limited described. With so many secondary outcomes how did you deal with problems with multiplicity?
Results:

The structure of the manuscript can also be improved. I like the structure with reporting the aims and then the results connected to the aim, but I find the results section much too long and difficult to read. This much be improved. I can only find three aims described in the result section? The fourth about testing the feasibility of measuring changes is not described as well as the results connected to this aim is not reported either?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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