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Reviewer's report:

General
The current paper provides sufficient replies to my previous concerns where possible. The authors have appropriately attempted to provide results on a very small sample in the most legitimate manner. The conduction of this type of study is quite challenging and the work is very important. However, I remain concerned about how much of a contribution this paper will make to a literature marked by small sample sizes and limited conclusions.

The second reviewer asked about effect sizes being provided and the authors have chosen not to include those. I would also have liked to see the effect sizes. The small sample size is the reason to provide them as opposed to the reason not to-in my view. Reliance on just presenting the norms still leads the reader to speculate about what might be different statistically. For example, role functioning emotional on the SF 36 decreases after treatment. Again, this is hard to interpret.

The primary strength of this paper remains that they showed that the treatment was feasible in their health care system and the revisions better reflect that.
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Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What next?: Reject because too small an advance to publish

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable
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