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REVISION ASSESSMENT FROM THE ACADEMIC PEER REVIEWER:

Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? No

Reviewer comments: I’m afraid my main concern regarding Figure 1 is still not addressed, and I think there’s no way to resolve this unless the manuscript is substantially rewritten to tell the story differently.

Specifically, I previously mentioned that results from Figure 1 seems to be driven, in part, by increased HRSD in the control group. Upon a closer look at the Results section (and please correct me if I’m wrong), I think the authors have observed a significant interaction between time and ABM, but no significant post-hoc t-tests in either comparison? This suggests that the interaction is driven by effects from both directions (higher HRSD in control and lower HRSD in ABM), albeit nonsignificant in either way. I think this confusion can be avoided if all statistical comparisons are reported, as opposed to reporting only the significant ones.

To address this, the authors did the post hoc sensitivity test to put the two groups on the same level. This is fine, but now the authors report a significant difference in HRSD between ABM and placebo (main effect), and no interaction anymore. Again, complete reporting of all statistical comparisons is suggested here. The data here (baseline at 7.5 for ABM and 7.2 for placebo, to 7.3 and 8.1 after two weeks) now really suggest an increase in HRSD in controls, and no effect of ABM.

Since Figure 3 clearly shows that ABM works differently for everyone, and may even backfire for some patients, the key finding from this study for me is that "AB change may be a useful clinical measure since it is sensitive to individual differences in HRSD", as opposed to ABM as a treatment.

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

No

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

No

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

No

**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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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

Acceptable
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