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Reviewer’s report:

This is well done and well written article on an important topic. The authors have done a good job given the constraints they faced, namely the small sample size in the trial. The results are somewhat unspectacular, but they are what they are, and the authors have reported them as such. My only question would be whether the impacts of CBT would be expected to show up in either a utility score or the HADs. I would think that the main benefits would be in adaption and coping, aspects that would be measured to some degree by a utility measure or a HADs, but not very well. An alternative would have been to use a WTP or other type of measure directly (rather than indirectly through the HADs). This might be included in the limitations/next steps.
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