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Reviewer's report:

I have reviewed the submitted manuscript and found some points concerning its content and impact. General points:

1. Though the manuscript is well conceived, it is overwritten at times. The introduction can be condensed in order to more clearly indicate the added value of this study.
2. Spelling mistakes and grammar need to be checked.
3. The distinction between the different sections could be improved by using formatted (sub)headings.

Abstract:

1. Please use a maximum of three to ten keywords.

Methods/data collection:

1. The authors refer to Bowers et al (2015) for inclusion and exclusion criteria. I think these can be informative here. 2. It would be interesting to know how the random allocation was implemented. 3. The results of the fidelity analysis should be placed in the results section.
4. Means and standard deviations should be provided with every statistic (e.g. age). 5. The reason for using only the 'most notable response' could be explained more clearly. How did RAs decide which response was the most notable one (i.e. did they have guidelines in the handbook?) and why were not multiple notable responses collected instead of an overall response?

Data analysis:

1. The data analysis should be more elaborate.

Discussion:

1. Similar to the background information, the discussion could be condensed in order to make a clearer statement on what can be learned from this study.

Level of interest

Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published

Quality of figures

All images and figures within the manuscript should be genuine i.e. without evidence of manipulation. No specific feature within an image may be enhanced, obscured, moved, removed, or introduced. If you have concerns about the veracity of the figures you should choose the first option below.

Statistical review
Is it essential that this manuscript is seen by an expert statistician? If so, please give your reasons in your report.
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