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Reviewer's report:

This is a really fascinating paper detailing very good practice in the development of a complex intervention - integrating good quality qualitative research and interrogation of the relevant literature.

It would benefit, however, from highlighting whether this is indeed a novel approach (and if so how) or, rather, whether it is applying good practice in intervention development from one type of complex intervention to a different type of complex intervention (e.g. to the broad area of mental health / therapy or the adaptation of therapy for clinical depression and GAD, ...).

It would benefit from the addition of a Box to clearly explain Morita Therapy - many readers will not be aware of its key principles and practices and this may help understand some of the findings presented.

Some sentences are quite unclear - particular in the findings sections - and a Box that readers can refer back to may help with this.

I think Table 3 would be better split the each half appearing in the part of the manuscript for the relevant section.

It would probably make sense to refer to the therapist participants in Stage 3 as 'therapists', not participants.

The objective and some of the aims/research questions would be better if not written in the plural personal pronoun, for example

To develop a deliverable and acceptable Morita Therapy outpatient protocol for a UK clinical population??
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