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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript describes a qualitative evaluation of "life rooms' a social prescribing model of care for people with mental health needs. The study design is suited to the research question and the authors have written a manuscript that overall is very well written and easy to follow and will be of interest to the readership of the journal. I have a few recommendations for minor revisions to the manuscript as listed below:
1. Abstract P2 line 34: the statement "that attribute toward" does not make sense to me. Please revise.
2. Abstract P2 line 42 should read "benefit of" rather than "benefit from"
3. Background P3 line 30 use "addressing" rather than "addresses" and on line 36 change "need for an integrated" to "need for integrated"
4. Background P4 line 11 change "it is also highlights" to "It also highlights" and the sentence on lines 15-20 does not make sense to me - I do not have a suggestion but please revise this.
5. Methods P5 line 56 I think should read "service users'" rather than "services users'"
6. Page 6 line 6 "five focus groups were initially scheduled"
7. Methods - participants and recruitment section - how was purposeful sampling utilised? please explain?
8. Results P7 lines 54-59 - perhaps this could go in the methods section
9. Results P9 lines 46-48 quote needs to be italicised
10. Discussion P13 line 43 "really" should read "real"
11. Conclusions P14 lines 4-7 (second sentence) - this does not make sense to me as the sentence is fragmented. Please revise I think some words are missing.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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