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Reviewer's report:

I think the authors have put together a thorough revision and response to my comments. The paper has improved substantially, also because the focus of the paper is now more on the usage and users themselves instead of on the effects of the intervention. I have only one minor comment:

In the results you mention differences between interested and non-interested participants on 'baseline' scores. But which baseline is this? Baseline for the full trial, so before any use of the intervention? Or baseline of this study, so at the time they have indicated their interest in prolonged access to the intervention?

Furthermore, as you have outcome measures at both initial baseline and time of re-randomization, did you check whether there was a difference in improvement on outcomes within the first 3 months? E.g. were people who experienced improvement more likely to wish to continue with the intervention? This would be very interesting to see.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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