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Reviewer's report:

General
I am not satisfied with the "limitation of the study". It is more a statement that the results of this follow-up is unlikely to be a result of a placebo-effect, which I strongly disagree upon. Thus, I want a comment that this study can be a result of a placebo-effect. In addition it can also be a statistically error in terms of regression towards means.

The present "limitation of the study" is merely a justification of an inappropriate study-design and I want changes in line with the above mentioned suggestions.

Another alternative maybe to wait for the results from the randomized study (SCS vs EECP) mentioned by the authors.
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