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Reviewer's report:

This is a very interesting and rigorous piece of research, which provides an important piece of the jigsaw with regard to the findings of the FNP trial.

It is very well conducted, analysed and written. A few minor observations are as follows:

p.13. Integration with existing services...are there better quotations to demonstrate the first sentence.

p.14. 'usual and FNP arms' would be better as 'treatment as usual and FNP arms'

p. 16. I wold cut this quotation so that it reads as follows '...my most particular difficult client I've done over and above the amount of visits...' because the rest is irrelevant and makes it confusing.

p.20 line 16. 'support' should be 'supported'; line 21 insert 'of' before '41.5'

p.21. It isn't clear here in what way the Netherlands evaluation differed from UK in terms of age entry.

p.22. Was it an a priori or post hoc analysis.

p.22 line 7-12 this paragraph doesn't make clear what the significance of this is.

p.24. replace 'our' with 'the'

I am also wondering if you need a short sectioning detailing the strengths and limitations of the study using criteria of trust worthiness etc., by Guba and Lincoln.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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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