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Reviewer's report:

Minor essential revisions

Abstract-Line 31, I am not sure the word “polices” belongs. I think you meant policies.
Abstract Line 53-I recommend “maintained a similar attentive level”
Line 166-How many cases were yours drawn from?
Line 172 Please clarify “natural units”
Methods-Please explain the length of these scenarios, and the way in which your participants performed. IE was it solely an exercise in assessment, or did they engage in treatment.
Method-Your approach to relative cue weights was very good.
Line 222 does the text reading “1-“ belong
Line 232 use and in lieu of &
Participants-section-were there any more descriptive variables available for your participants? IE age, gender ect. I think it is always helpful to fully describe your population for people thinking of applying your approach to a different population.
Line 235 it would be helpful if, earlier in the manuscript you included some form of description of the scenarios. It will make judging the results in the relative weights section more effectively.
266 How did you determine that heart rate use was appropriate?
Lines 270-275-please list the actual names of the cues.
The tables for the paper are very good.
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