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Reviewer's report:

1. The question posed by authors is well-defined. Indeed, the background is well-presented and introduces the study in an appropriate and specific context (Introduction, par.1). While previous reviews gave special attention only to one component of well-being in Multiple Sclerosis, this paper focuses to psychological intervention in MS characterizing symptom’s changes and connection between body and mind. It considers mind and body as mutually influenced: this is its strength and originality.

2. This article is composed of the necessary sections. It is also displayed in a clear and succinct form. Therefore, it could be reproducible by other researchers who working in the same field.

3. The quality of written English is good and acceptable. Grammar is also of sufficient quality. Therefore, I think it isn’t necessary a revision by an expert in English editing and scientific writing.

4. Flow-chart (Graph.1) is simple, clean and free of extraneous details.

5. Relations, contradictions, gaps and inconsistencies in literature are well stressed. The discussion addresses research questions posed in the section “Introduction” and shows them referring to previously studies (Discussion, par.4).

6. Conclusions are useful to suggest the next step in solving MS field’s gap (Conclusions, par.5). Moreover, they drawn from the study should be valid and result directly from the data shown.

7. The title clearly and accurately reflects the aims and the findings of the review.

• Major Compulsory Revisions

---

• Minor Essential Revisions

8. You could introduce if you have considered only articles in English language. You could also say if you’ve included those that were peer-reviewed, published, original articles on clinical trials of psychological intervention for MS (Method, par.2 - lines 184-189).

9. You could also specified that you’ve ensured to not include duplicates, avoiding biased results (Method, par.2 - lines 189-192).
10. Could you introduce a caption of your table, please? (Table 1)
11. You could introduce other columns in your table (Table 1) such as “country”, “study design”, “homework” and “instrument”, in order to deep better the features of the studies you have collected, specifying these aspects in the section about results.

• Discretionary Revisions

12. You could shift “Keywords” (Lines 35-37) below the abstract.
13. You could consolidate the studies’ table, reducing it in less pages, because it seems too dispersive. As an alternative, you could repeat the labels at the header of every page (Table 1).
14. Limitations are well-exposed and supported. Nevertheless, you may deepen them and create a section aside (Discussion, par.4).

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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