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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have done a thorough job of addressing the reviewers’ comments. I just have two comments to make.

1. … ‘at the end of treatment’ or ‘at 10 weeks’ should be added to the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis 1:
Our primary hypothesis was that, compared to a waiting list, ICBT would lead to greater reductions in IBS-symptoms.

2. The authors have misinterpreted my point about ITT. I wasn’t suggesting using last observation forward as I agree; modeling has now replaced this method. However, if you have data for at least one follow-up, a mixed model will keep these people in the model. Therefore a better way to assess if gains were maintained at 12 months without losing such a large percentage of cases is to include all 3 time points for the treatment group in the model. I realise this would be difficult for the post treatment comparison between groups as there is only one follow-up point, so perhaps in this context, what the authors have done with the last observation forward is one way to test what happens if all people are considered.
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