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Reviewer's report:

This is a well written paper of good scientific quality and relevance to the readership of this journal and I recommend it for publication.

I have a couple of recommended revisions:

1. It is difficult to understand what VCE++ means in the methods section of the abstract. Since the abstract should make sense as a stand-alone piece can the authors include a definition of VCE++ please.

2. There is a new update just published for the Cochrane systematic review of PtDAs (ref 3) which would be better for the readers of the journal to have as a reference.

3. Can the authors provide some explanation of what was contained in the different PtDA versions? What was the information content? What type of VCE was used? How were participants referred to the VCE in Exp 2 in the VCE++ arm? Other researchers who may wish to build on this work should be able to see what has been done. In other words, there needs to be a better description of the intervention in each arm of the studies.

4. Perhaps it could be noted that the VCE did not appear to cause any harm to participants other than the time involved in completing (which was not onerous). This is an important point given the recommendation to test this on 'real patients'.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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