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Reviewer’s report:

Discretionary revision

The authors have done a thorough job in addressing comments of the peer reviewers.

A couple of points:

1. I think risk of bias is possible even with structured diagnostic interviews i.e. the SCID. It may be enough to simply state that the outcome assessor was not blinded. It might also be useful to explicitly state that the participants were not blinded either (if participants were led to believe that all intervention arms, including the enhanced TAU were equally effective this is not an issue but if they were aware that the enhanced TAU may not be as good then bias can creep in to their self-report assessments)

2. The authors have made it clear that they used the last observation carried forward approach for the ITT analysis; they may still wish to highlight to readers what the limitations are of both this and per protocol analyses are.

It is good to see the findings clearly articulated and a useful discussion.
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