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1. The authors deserve compliments for the way in which they respond to the comments of the reviewers. Yet, I do still have a few questions.

2. I had some questions about their way of measuring cost-effectiveness. Reacting on that, the authors explain that in the pilot there was no follow-up period. I knew that of course. My point however was: given this limitation it would be if they would not pretend they seriously measured cost-effectiveness. During treatment people generally do make less use of medical and emotional other forms of help. If you only measure during this treatment it doesn’t say anything. On top of that, their measure (TIC-P) of cost-effectiveness is meager, as I pointed out in the first review (point 2). I would suggest to leave it out altogether.

3. A small but strange point came out new in the revision, on page 13 under figure 2. The authors report p-values in their new dealing with clinical significance. This is quite irrelevant here. It is not clear against what they test their percentages. The authors just need to determine and report the percentage of clin.improved participants. That will be enough.

4. Same page, one paragraph below. ‘Study therapist’ should be ‘therapist’.

5. I still have questions about their psychologist. What kind of genius is this person? Giving active en serious guidance to patients (as they describe it in the Discussion) in on average 6’ per module, when some people have daily contacts still seems amazing to me. In the revision the authors added how the guidance time was measured: Minutes of being logged in. This seems a hard and unquestionable measure. But is it? What about logging in > printing the work of the patient > logging out > preparing the answers > logging in again and pasting the reaction > logging out. This is what many people normally do in this kind of interaction. Since guidance time is an issue these days it would enhance the value of the paper if the authors deal with this point more extensively.

6. I am not fully satisfied with the non-discussion of the drop-out.s. They report that people stopped for various reasons: lack of time, or other other issues. Why not give the exact numbers of how many people did not use all the modules? And investigate whether they did as well or less than those who did. Given the small numbers there is no need to test this. Inspection might suggest interesting new studies. E.g. a shortened program.
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