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1. Will the study design adequately test the hypothesis?

The intended sample size is small, for interventions that are likely only to have a modest benefit on symptoms over an above time, and almost certainly too small for meaningful subgroup analysis. Of course, a loss to follow up of 20% will be too great to allow any meaningful conclusion to be drawn from the study, but I am sure the investigators would agree.

2. Are sufficient details provided to allow replication of the work or comparison with related analyses: if not, what is missing?

The main thing with any complex intervention is that they are sufficiently well described for them to be replicated; for example the problem solving treatment, guided self help and physiotherapy protocols could be expanded in a supplement.

3. Is the planned statistical analysis appropriate?

It is unclear how the analysis plan will deal with those lost to follow up, or those who do not fill in their questionnaire: is there a plan to impute data?

4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation?

yes

5. Is the writing acceptable?

I think the labelling of three groups A,B,C is confusing. Why not just have a trial, and an observational cohort - much easier to understand.
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