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**Reviewer’s report:**

This research is a useful addition to the NPT literature, particularly with respect to implementation of interventions mental health services. In my view, however, it would benefit from further development in order to contextualize the research within the intended implementation context and to better understand the implications of the findings beyond the quantitative testing of the NPT theory by discussing the relevance of the work with respect to this particular intervention in this particular context (guided self-help for psychosis in UK mental health services) - from which others may learn and adapt to their context accordingly.

Specific comments:

**Introduction:**

It would be useful for the reader if the authors expanded on the section in which the application of NPT to various mental health related contexts was developed further. For example were these qualitative studies prospective or retrospective in nature? Overall, what does this body of literature tell us about the application of the NPT framework in understanding implementation of interventions in mental health contexts? (lines 100-108)

**Line 120 -** The authors discuss their plan to implement guided self-help for psychosis in services. It would be useful if they provided a brief description of the types of services they have in mind. I am aware they discuss staff working in a NHS mental health service in the UK but it would be helpful to have further description beyond this e.g. community-based services? What type of clients would be eligible? How would the service be implemented? (this material may also work better in the methods section). Overall it would be useful to have a richer description of the intended implementation context.

**Methods:**

It would be useful if the authors clearly described how each of the professional roles surveyed differ (psychological therapist, psychological wellbeing practitioner, mental health practitioner, support work), a present the methods (and paper more generally) assumes too much familiarity with the UK mental health service context.
Was any construct validity testing carried out (specifically testing for convergent and divergent validity)?

Discussion:

It would be helpful if the authors spent some time specifically discussing the implications of the three NPT factors that were supported in the current sample: coherence, cognitive participation and reflexive monitoring. What specifically do these results imply about implementing a guided self-help for psychosis arm in current UK NHS mental health services and how would this differ between different arms of the larger service?

**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 recommend additional statistical review

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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