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Reviewer's report:

Thanks for the opportunity to review this paper.

It is a detailed, high quality study that makes a useful contribution to the field.

I think there are a few issues that should be clarified/corrected prior to publication.

First is a major issue. The title (and parts of the text) imply a degree of specificity (to health related aspects of the CBR guidelines) that is not borne out in the search or the conclusions. The review and the delphi process were not limited in focus to the health dimensions of the CBR guidelines, indeed they were not even limited to CBR. As such I don't think you can be that specific in your conclusions. For example, numerous "mental disability" and "mental rehabilitation" articles mention "community" - and therefore are picked up in your search - but the approaches described in a few of them bear little or no relevance to the CBR model.

The second is a format/presentation issue. Results presented in the body of the article are very limited. Readers are referred to the extensive supplementary material. My concern is that in many cases, readers just print an article and expect the supplementary material to be just that (not crucial to understanding the results), but in this case they are. For example, when I read the CMOCs presented in figure 3 I found them unconvincing. It was not until I returned to the article, retrieved supplementary File 2, that I realised they are actually substantial. I think this needs considerable thought and improvement.

Some minor issues:

The terms "mental disability" and "mental rehabilitation" are cumbersome and imprecise terms. They imply intellectual and cognitive disabilities (but appear to exclude these), and are not terms that are accepted by people with mental health problems.

Sentence 319-321 is very confusing
I have previously seen CMOC statements depicted as "Context PLUS Mechanism EQUALS Outcome". Your presentation of the relationships between C, M and O is not strong - they are presented more as three independent aspects. I think this requires clarification, or ideally, if you can more clearly portray these relationships, adding them in.
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