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Reviewer's report:

I thank the invitation to review the present protocol of research entitled: "Neuropsychological Management of Multiple Sclerosis: Evaluation of the added value of a supervised and customized cognitive rehabilitation program for self-used at home (SEPIA): study protocol for a randomized controlled trial".

Abstract section: Why are you going to evaluate QoL 1 week after intervention and not just after the intervention?

Lines 92-95: If traditional neuropsychological evaluation systems detect adequately cognitive disorders but cognitive complaints not, should you include the first one system as the gold standard to select the sample?

In general, should you prevent low levels of treatment adherence? you have stated computer-assisted techniques allow engaging and fun activities (lines 99-104). Can this issue be generalized?

I would link the paragraph starting in line 105 to the previous paragraph.

I would link the paragraph starting in line 129 to the previous paragraph.

In the abstract, you detailed one week after the end of the intervention. However, in the design section, you state "...two weeks after the end... Please, revise this part of the text.

I would delete the next sentence included in line 145: "...for assessments (screening, baseline, short and long-term retest)." This sound reiterative.

Please, include a "limitation section" at the end of the discussion section, detailing the possible limitations of your study.
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