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**Reviewer's report:**

- **Major Compulsory Revisions**

  The authors have responded to the previous review and the manuscript is much improved. Two significant problems remain that, if addressed, would strengthen the paper significantly.

  1) The authors argue that the intervention was in fact evidence-based, though I continue to disagree with this contention. The intervention was composed of a series of components that were evidenced-based, but their combination was, in fact, new, as was the setting for implementation. Moreover, the authors indicate that one of the components (online directory) was cumbersome to use and too time-consuming to use within consultations. Most EBPs would not be characterized in this way, calling into question whether the specific components in fact had an evidence-base rather than a theoretical base alone. For these reasons, I believe it is misleading to call this an evidence-based intervention. The manuscript would be improved by dropping this designation and discussion that revolves around it, and including as a limitation that it is not possible to determine whether the lack of results were a function of the intervention, problems with implementation, or both.

  2) The section describing analytic methods remains weak in terms of theoretical approach and details about the analytic process. Much greater detail is needed.

- **Minor Essential Revisions**

  1) Although the authors removed some language describing context specific to the NHS, other such language remains (e.g., “The imminent changes around commissioning exacerbated these uncertainties.”; “The commissioning manager…” It would be helpful if these terms could be explained for those not familiar with specifics of the NHS.

- **Discretionary Revisions**

  None
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