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**Reviewer's report:**

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

1. The title needs to better reflect the aim of this particular study. If you read the title it looks like that it is an RCT whereas it is a feasibility study of how to randomize. Is that what you are trying to say?

2. The abstract and more specifically the results need to be more stringent reflecting the findings and the level of statistics reported. To write: “average scores suggested that CCBT increases acceptance more than physiotherapy (increase of 7.9 versus 5.1) and change in disability and pain from baseline to 6 months were greater in the CCBT group than in the physiotherapy group” just based on point estimates since this can be considered as an overstatement.

3. Please, specify what physiotherapeutic aims and treatment where delivered. To write physiotherapy was delivered as usual will compare to write “psychology delivered as usual”. Furthermore, to state that physiotherapy “included at least 60% exercise” compares to write psychology “included at least 60% of exposure”.

4. Please, report CI in the tables and results.

**Minor Essential Revisions**

Please, see attached reviewed document.

**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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