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**Author’s response to reviews:**

Dear Dr Christina Jones,

We would be delighted if you would re-consider our article entitled Supporting harm reduction through peer support (SHARPS): Testing the feasibility and acceptability of a peer-delivered, relational intervention for people with problem substance use who are homeless, to improve health outcomes, quality of life and social functioning, and reduce harms: Study protocol for publication in BMC Pilot and Feasibility Studies.
We would like to sincerely thank the reviewers for the helpful and constructive comments on our submitted paper. We have uploaded a document where we address all comments made by reviewers systematically and a tracked changes document with all changes made highlighted in yellow. Only two comments were not addressed in full; one due to conditions of our funding from NIHR (we cannot change our research questions/aims/objectives) and the other due to the nature of the study (we do not have a study hypothesis). We have noted where this is the case in the table.

As noted previously, the content of this article has not been submitted for publication elsewhere. There are no conflicts of interest. The study has been funded by National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Heath Technology Assessment Programme (16/153/14). No other financial support was provided. While NIHR requires anonymous peer review we have, at this stage, left in identifying information such as the University of Stirling and the funder ID because this is a protocol paper and therefore hard to anonymise. If you would like me to completely identify the manuscript and supplementary files please let me know and I will do that.

I can confirm that we have funding for open access publication if we are successful in having this paper accepted (IN-1130669).

I hope this revised paper is of interest to yourself and the Editorial Board.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Tessa Parkes