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Stats look all very good apart from three minor points you could trust the authors to sort out (if you agree with me):

1. I would prefer to see a sentence justifying the 2:1 ratio of intervention allocation (unless I’ve missed it), though this does not affect the robustness of the conclusions at all.

2. I would prefer to see the estimate and confidence interval for the primary analysis in the abstract, though I recognize that interpretation of the AUC may make this less helpful than usual.

3. Given the width of the confidence interval, I feel the conclusion that “three sessions conferred no additional benefits over one” is a bit strong. Would it not be safer to say “there was no evidence that three sessions conferred any additional benefits over one”?

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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