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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this protocol for an RCT of MCT vs EMDR. MCT for PTSD has produced promising results in previous trials. Yet, there is still a lack of sufficiently powered RCTs that investigate the effects of MCT vs relevant control groups. As such, this study is highly important, as it will strengthen our knowledge on the effectiveness of MCT compared to a frequently used, evidence-based treatment, namely EMDR.

Overall, I believe this protocol thoroughly and clearly presents the plan for the RCT, including its rationale and detailed methodological considerations. Strengths amongst others include that this study is an effectiveness trial being conducted in a psychiatric unit, and that mediators are measured on a session-to-session basis.

I believe the following could be clarified:

* In the abstract, for clarity please add "follow-up" after 3 and 12 months --> 3 and 12 months follow-up.

* In the section regarding participants, it is stated that patients with severe depression are excluded. How is this defined and determined?

* PDS: the scoring of the PDS could be described more clearly. From the text it is not clear that the symptom severity score comprises the 17 items related to DSM-IV symptoms.
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