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This is a low-key but important paper, as it uses the example of a small project to highlight key issues in collaborative care. A strength is that the authors have a strong understanding of how the model works, and can integrate the clinicians and researchers perspective. The evaluation is based upon the comments of users and providers utilising an uncomplicated but helpful framework, as the authors have developed a model that includes the main components of effective collaborative practice and use it to identify key enablers and barriers to the successful implementation and spread of a model, while also identifying the challenges in translating policy into practice. The qualitative approach allows for a broader exploration of themes, and is particularly appropriate with the relatively small sample size. Although other papers have addressed these issues, the way these finding have been integrated and hang together contribute to its usefulness. The one area that I feel was overlooked was the changes that a practice needs to make to accommodate a new model, and how this was rated by providers, although they refer to the ability of participants to solve problems together. And while the findings are consistent of studies in other places, they also throw up opportunities for improvement. They're key conclusion, "collaborative change requires some funding support" highlights a reality if collaborative care is to spread and flourish.

A few specific comments
* Line 30 the phrase "health policy directs treatment to…" Needs some expansion or a specific reference
* Line 47 Co-location needs further definition. It appears that the authors are talking about integration, not providers just being located in the same facility but working in parallel
* Line 50 - How brief is "brief" for treatment episodes
* Line 78 - can you clarify whether these percentages are of cases in their practice or cases they see
* Line 91 "position paper" requires a reference
* Line 105 - Can you define "complex interventions"
* Line 115 - Can you elaborate on what these social and professional skills are
* Line 125. I agree - the patients perspective is critical
* Line 166 - can you spell out what HFHT stands for
* Line 173 - the use of a single EMR and the integration of the psychologists is important
* Line 184 - what were these more severe problems
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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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

Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal