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Reviewer's report:

This is a well written and interesting paper describing a mixed-methods feasibility study to test a standardised group based patient education and exercise programme called GLA:D Back.

Overall, the piece is balanced and informative.

I only have one major concern:

There is not enough detail about the underpinning theory and behavioural framework or logic model for the GLA:D Back intervention. The reader is left not knowing what innovative changes in the way patients are educated by clinicians the team hope to achieve through this programme. In addition, it was unclear how this theory fed into the questions asked within the qualitative aspects of this study.

Minor suggestions:

Title: Suggest re-wording the title to state 'Feasibility of implementing a training course for clinicians'

Background:
Line 12 change 'recommendation' to 'recommendations'

Methods: Page 5 line 51… typing error 'ts' should be 'Patients'

The improvements expected to be seen from the training course in the way clinicians educated their patients about back pain are not made explicit in the section about the 'Training of clinicians'
How were these clinicians identified and recruited to attend the course? How representative are they?
The GLA:D Back intervention is described elsewhere - but it would be useful to note here what educational components are covered within the intervention (e.g. medication, sleep, work etc…)

The discussion is a little long a points of learning from the study could be made more succinctly and better summarised perhaps in a figure?
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