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Reviewer's report:

This is a well written and interesting paper. The abstract and introduction were concise. The qualitative analysis on feasibility provided much needed insight into practitioners opinions on the intervention. While the quantitative analysis was restricted by the small n (due to the inevitable lack of collection of all information across sites) the analyses were appropriate - although extreme caution follows the t-tests on only site 1 due to small n. My minor recommendations for improvement are outlined below:

1. The open version of the MeST outline on page 12, lines 276 to 282 would read better in the method section.

2. While it was briefly mentioned as a caveat earlier in the paper, the discussion could have elaborated upon how coinciding therapies could have explained some of the pre-post change. In addition with larger n, a look into the pre-post measurement subdivided into different subsections (e.g., outpatient vs inpatient; closed versus open or mixed MeST; older adults versus younger adults) would have been interesting

3. The total n in table 4 do not appear to follow from the sum of the n in site 1 to 4.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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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.
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