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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?
   Yes. I could find no studies of a similar nature, and this is a useful study. The authors define their terms and the multi-faceted intervention well.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?
   Generally yes but it would be hard to replicate the work without more detail on what, for example, the local multidisciplinary QI team actually did and how extensive the feedback reports were.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?
   I’m not a statistician but the data do seem to be analysed appropriately, and appear to be well presented and well organised.

4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation?
   Yes, they do. The fact that there is a lack of effect being reported lends credibility to the study.

5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   It does. I note the trial has been registered: CCT ISRCTN50542146.

6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   In general, they are. I found no glaring problems and the structure of the discussion, using sign posted headings, help the reader navigate through the paper.

7. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Broadly, they do. The title is long, but it describes not only the study but the results of the study. The abstract is succinct and understandable.

8. Is the writing acceptable?
   The weak point of the paper is the writing. As I read through it, I saw multiple
opportunities to improve the English expression.

Summary - Major compulsory revisions
The key major compulsory revision in my judgement is to have someone review the manuscript so that the English expression is improved to the standard of the Journal and therefore the study is more likely to be widely read and cited.

A second one is to reconsider the extent to which the methods could be replicated elsewhere. A clearer description of the interventions, as indicated above in point two, might help.

All other comments should be considered by the authors but do not lead to further major compulsory revisions in my view.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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