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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper.

Overall, this is a clear and well-written paper, based on a well-designed study drawing on multiple data sources.

I have just a few minor recommendations:


- Page 18, line 45 - 48. The statement "Use of GP services also decreased; however, this may be attributable to the difference in timeframes." Should be revised. The figures suggest that average (presumably median) number of GP visits was 12 over 12 months and 6 over 6 months, so seemingly no change at all, which is probably a good thing… Use of mental health services should not replace regular visits to the GP.

- On a note related to the points above, "average" should be replaced with whatever measure of central tendency was used (e.g., presumably medians were used) for the following elements of Table 5: "Average no. of consultations (range)" and "Average no. of consultations for mental health reasons (range)"

- Page 19, line 16 to 21: The authors state "Among Floresco clients who completed the RAS-DS on two or more occasions, significant increases in self-reported mental health recovery were seen across three of four domains (all but 'Connecting and belonging')" - however looking at the data reported in Table 6, it would appear that there was in fact significant change over time for "Connecting and belonging". It seems like the domain without significant change was "Doing things I value". These figures should be checked and the text updated.

Thank you again for the opportunity to review this manuscript.
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