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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript describes an interesting study of PT for cervicogenic somatic tinnitus (CST). The authors make a good case for the importance of the study, given the lack of RCTs in this area. The manuscript generally provides sufficient detail for the important aspects of the protocol. I have the following recommendations for major compulsory revisions to clarify some aspects of the manuscript:

1. Abstract: the description of the outcome assessment points could be stated more clearly. As it is written, I was not sure whether the first and second mention of "six weeks" were referring to the same time point.

2. Abstract, last sentence, it is not clear why secondary outcomes are measured at a different time point from the primary outcome(s).

3. Introduction, 1st sentence beginning "For instance" is not a complete sentence.

4. Outcome measures section, what is meant by the "effect size" being a 13 point reduction for the TFI. Does this mean the threshold for clinically relevant improvement? Same question for similar statement at the end of the paragraph for NBQ.

5. I did not understand the rationale for the primary (null) hypothesis. The active period for the treatment group is 6 weeks, then they are "inactive" from 6-12 weeks. The wait list group has been active at the end of 12 weeks. So, if I understand correctly, the null hypothesis is that there is no difference between 2 groups who received the PT, one of which just received it & one of which received it 6 weeks earlier. I was expecting the primary comparison point to be at 6 week, comparing an active vs. untreated group.

6. It is not necessary to list both H0 and HA.

7. The TFI is initially stated as the primary outcome, then later in the methods it is stated that the "primary outcome is a change in the scores of the TFI and NBQ." These should be made concurrent.

8. The discussion seemed to end abruptly. The statements about feasibility of recruitment may be better placed earlier, and the authors may want to consider a more general concluding paragraph.
**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

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

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