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Reviewer's report:

General comments:
This paper describes the design of an RCT aimed to evaluate the effects of neurocognitive and social cognitive remediation in Ultra-High Risk for psychosis patients. The manuscript has importance in the field of psychology and psychiatry. The manuscript is well-organized and well-written. As this protocol has already received ethical approval and external funding approval, the current peer review will only consider the acceptability of writing and whether sufficient details to allow replication are provided. Sufficient details are provided to allow replication of the study if the authors address some of the comments below. In addition, I have a few other comments the authors may wish to address.

Major Essential Revisions

Abstract
1. Please include the aims/objectives of the study in the abstract and the trial acronym

Background
2. Please define and introduce the constructs in this manuscript (e.g., prodromal intervention, psychosis [and prevalence], social cognition, neurocognition, cognitive remediation) as the broader public of readers may need to be educated about these constructs.
3. The background could be improved (would be stronger) if the scientific and clinical relevance is more clearly described.
4. Please include hypotheses/objectives to the manuscript and trial design.

Methods
5. Please describe the method of delivery of assessments (e.g., paper pencil/online, location of assessment) and SCID) background and training of assessors and psychometric properties of all measurements.
6. Please include information about data management and harms (see Spirit guidelines)

Minor Essential Revisions
Background

1. Please add statistics to the sentence ‘in the most recent meta-analysis on prodromal interventions…’ to be more informative.

2. Social cognition is hypothesized to act as a mediator between neurocognition and functional outcome. Has this been investigated previously?

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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