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Journal: BMC Psychiatry

Dear Mrs De Salis and Mrs Clayton, Thank you very much for your response to the submission of our study protocol, and we are pleased to read that it is potentially acceptable for publication in BMC Psychiatry, upon minor changes. We thank the editor(s) for the additional feedback. This revision letter includes our response to your comments and an outline of the changes we have made in line with your feedback. A revised clean version of the manuscript is also submitted.

– Please state in the funding section that the study protocol was peer reviewed by the funding body.
R: We have added this statement in the revised manuscript. We changed the following in the section Declarations (paragraph Funding): •Page 35 (line 759): The study protocol was peer reviewed by the funding body.

– Please ensure that all figures/tables and supplementary files are cited within the text. Any items which are not cited may be deleted by our production department upon publication. (Fig 3 & 4)
R: We thank the editor for pointing out that Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 were not cited in the text. We have changed the text in the section Methods/Design (paragraph Intervention) into: •Page 13 (line 306): A flowchart of the first contact is provided in Fig. 2 (Appendix). •Page 13 (line 320): A flowchart of follow-up monitoring is provided in Fig. 3 (Appendix). When reading the manuscript, we have also identified a spelling error in the section Methods/Design (paragraph Scientific evaluation) in Table 2 ‘Dimensions and definitions of the RE-AIM framework with variables and data sources’, under the Dimension ‘Implementation & Maintenance’ in Pillar 2: swift access: ‘submissions’ should be ‘admissions’. We have corrected this spelling error. We hope to have met your comments by the adjustments made in our revised
manuscript and are looking forward to your response. Yours sincerely, on behalf of the co-authors, Emma Hofstra