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Reviewer’s report:

General
I can see some small differences with the previous study. Still it remains totally unclear to me how you can study the efficacy of an intervention after (!) you have found out that it is not feasible and not effective.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
I feel that the conclusion about the positive result on the mental health subscale is due to chance after having studied about 20 possible outcomes all with a negative result. Given the results of the previous study, I do not see any reason to be optimistic about future studies on this intervention.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No
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