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To:
Editor, BMC Neurology

Maastricht, November 21st

Dear editor,

Please find enclosed our revised manuscript entitled ‘An Economic Evaluation of an Augmented Cognitive Behavioural Intervention vs. Computerized Cognitive Training for Post-stroke Depressive Symptoms’ (MS: 4010554501734941) by Mitchel van Eeden, Joyce Kootker, Silvia Evers, Caroline van Heugten, Alexander Geurts, and Ghislaine van Mastrigt.

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. We carefully considered all comments made by the editor and revised our manuscript accordingly. To the best of our capacity, we made textual adjustments throughout the entire manuscript according to the provided minor revisions. Following the suggestions for major revisions, table 1 presents the way we handled these suggestions.

All authors have read and approved the revised manuscript; the manuscript has not been submitted elsewhere nor published elsewhere in whole or in part, except as an abstract.

If accepted, the manuscript will not be published elsewhere, including electronically in the same form, in English or in any other language, without the written consent of the copyright-holder.

We hope that you are willing to consider the publication of our manuscript in BMC Neurology.

Yours sincerely, on behalf of all authors,

Mitchel van Eeden, MSc
Department of Health Services Research (HSR), School for Public Health and Primary Care (CAPHRI), Faculty of Health, Medicine and Life Sciences (FHML), Maastricht University

p.a. Duboisdomein 30, 6229 GT Maastricht, P.O. Box 616, 6200 MD Maastricht, The Netherlands
Tel: +31 (0) 433 88 17 31
Fax: +31 (0) 433 88 41 62
e-mail: mitchel.vaneeden@maastrichtuniversity.nl
Table 1. Editor’s modification suggestions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Editor’s modification suggestions</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thank you very much for the suggested adjustments. We think that your suggestions improved the quality of our manuscript significantly. In general, we made all minor textual adjustments you suggested. In this table, we would like to respond to your other suggestions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please check the permissible word count for the abstract, as it seems very long. Please shorten as required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for this feedback. Since we started adjusting the manuscript according to the reviewers’ suggestions, we did not pay enough attention to the word count of the abstract. We shortened the abstract according to the required word count.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 62 “Sixty-one patients ?? Very small? Why outcomes also not bootstrapped?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We agree with you comment that 61 patients is a small population. We aimed for a higher number but due to several inclusion problems we managed to include only 61 patients. We did bootstrap all cost data in our analyses. We state in the methods:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We used non-parametric bootstrapping (5000 replications) to estimate the uncertainty surrounding the ICER, due to the highly skewed cost distribution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 62 QALY = 12 months so why 8 months of FU?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for this very useful comment. After careful consideration we noticed we showed a 12 month time horizon in Figure 1, but reported eight months in the text. This absolutely wrong as the time horizon of this study was 12 months. We are fully aware of this mistake in reporting, and we thank you very much for noticing something really important. It now states:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments took place post treatment (T1), at eight months follow-up (T2) and at twelve months follow-up (T3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So what does this study add to the literature? Please make a summary statement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for this relevant addition. We agree that the current manuscript lacks this statement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Therefore, we added:

*In addition to other literature, this study provided new insights into the potential cost-effectiveness of an adjusted cognitive behavioural therapy intervention.*

**Lines 143 ? 145 Add reference for surveys**

Thank you for this suggestion. We agree that it is relevant for readers to see references for all surveys used in our study. Therefore, we added references for all surveys.

**Lines 157 ? 159 Give some examples of goals**

We agree with this suggestion. Therefore, we added the following:

*These goals could capture domains as e.g. self-care, leisure, household, work, and improvement of mobility-related goals such as movement and walking.*

**Lines 426-427 I think that the poor recruitment rate and small samples size undermines any claims of generalizability and this should be rephrased or removed.**

We agree with this thought. This is something, which caused much debate amongst the authors. After considering this again, we chose to remove this sentence as we agree that generalizability is not a strength in a study with such a poor recruitment rate and small sample size.