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Reviewer’s report:

The authors are to be commended for responding to the previous feedback in a rigorous and fulsome manner. Below I have a listed a few minor editorial suggestions for consideration.

Minor essential revisions:

Background, para #5: typo “Relatively few studies have taken these techniques IN TO the realm of mental health care”

Study Aims: typo (word missing?) “To demonstrate a method of generating and agreeing ON? service improvement priorities for people with longer-term depression which …”

Under Results, Email Questionnaire – the section pasted following is confusing since it seemed that only 39 people participated but then the description is for 104: “Of these 104 individuals, just over half (55%) identified with a single stakeholder group with 44% identifying with two.”

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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