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Reviewer's report:

In their study, Kjellgren & Westman explore the influence of a program of 12 floating sessions on a number of health-related psychological and physiological variables, like stress, depression, sleep quality, and pain. Variables are assessed by a number of validated questionnaires. They find positive effects for the majority of variables and demonstrate in a very convincing manner the positive health effects of floating. The authors can be congratulated to this very nice study. The sample sizes is adequate as are the statistical methods used. It is a pity that the study was not continued in a cross-over fashion to show that the control group would show the same effect and that the effects in the treatment group would last.

I only have some minor essential revisions:

Methods:

p.5, l.10: "There were no significant differences regarding gender, age, cigarettes, snuff or alcohol between the two groups (independent samples t-tests, p = 0.256)." What does the p-value reflect? The mentioned t-tests should yield one p-value for each comparison.

p.6, l.12: To my knowledge, HAD should read HADS.

Results:

p.10, l.14: "(pair-samples t-tests, 5 % level)". Please explain "5% level". Does this refer to the significance threshold?

p.12, "Mindfulness and Altered states of consciousness". The authors transform their continuous into a categorical variable here to be able to run an ANOVA. There are numerous and well known problems associated with this procedure. As they have found a significant correlation, it is ok to run such an analysis as a further evaluation. The results, however, do not add much to the correlation result and could be omitted. The authors should, however, add a scatter plot for EDN vs. MAAS.

Table 1: This table should definitely contain the difference between the two groups. From my point of view, the total is much less informative and should be omitted.

It would also help a lot to have the results from Tables 1+2 in a plot. Probably, an interaction plots makes most sense or, better, an array of plots.
Discussion:
Please discuss, why Energy levels were by the treatment. Is energy considered something negative in the questionnaire used?
Please discuss, why a difference was found for worst but not normal pain.
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