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Reviewer's report:

Overall, the manuscript presents an interesting study that assesses outcomes between two counselling models at the Swedish National Alcohol Helpline. While interesting, the study does not elevate to a high level of innovation or strong theoretical rationale for conducting the study. It is unclear from the Introduction what the theoretical rationale is for the current study and its relative importance. More importantly, the Introduction specifies a specific hypothesis, but there is no theoretical rationale to back it up. The data analyses are slightly confusing with no clear mention of controlling for Type 1 error inflation as well as how baseline differences between the groups were actually assessed for. More importantly, the psychometric properties of the instruments used in this study did not receive any attention. Lastly, the outcomes are not that interesting as both groups fared equally well, which from how the manuscript was written, it is unclear if this is what was expected. As a result, enthusiasm for the manuscript was not high.

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

No

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

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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