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Reviewer's report:

P.7 line 4-7: For the group sessions, it would be great if the total number of sessions is mentioned.

P.7 line 36-39: The use of delayed entry intervention design should be explained in more details.

P.7 line 56 to P.8 line 32: Given that the waiting period of the delayed entry group (4 weeks) is different from the intervention period of the immediate group (6 weeks) and the intervention dosages of the 2 groups are different (6 weeks for immediate group and 8 weeks for delayed entry group), it would be great if the authors could elaborate more on their intention of having such research design, as well as how their compared the differences regarding the effectiveness of the G4V intervention between the 2 groups in the session of "Data and Methods".

P.7 line 56: The meaning of the sentence "Those randomized to the delayed entry group had their baseline interview (X) repeated at roughly 4 weeks (A1) prior to receiving the intervention as well as after intervention completion (B)." does not match with the one portrayed in Figure 1.

P.8 line 45: It would be great if the authors could elaborate more on the adoption of DSM-IV, rather than DSM-5 in this study.

P.8 line 51 to P.9 line 8: Sentences "PTSD Checklist Civilian (PCLC) is a self-report 17-item scale … … have good reliability and convergent validity." are repeated.

P.9 line 8-16: It would be great if the authors could explain more on the reason of highlighting the arousal subscale of having the greatest number of body-oriented symptoms among the 3 subscales.

P.14 line 16: Please clarify the meaning of "results not shown". It would be great if the p values could be reported.

P.16 line 16: The conclusion of "no significant change in health related quality of life over the study's duration" is contradicting with the results reported in P.13 line 25-36. More discussion on the results of different statistical analyses should be included.
P.16 line 53-59: More elaboration and clarification on the adoption of delayed entry approach is needed. It would be great if the authors could discuss how this approach is more suitable for this study / target populations than the traditional contemporaneous treatment-control randomization. For cross-group contamination, reference is needed.

P.16 line 59 to P.17 line 5: Please clarify "The use of … … secondary data collection" in this study. It would be great if the authors could indicate which part of the data belongs to secondary data.

P.25 Table 2: The wordings "enrollment score", "pre-intervention score" are quite confusing. It is suggested that the authors can make good use of the time points "A", "X", "A1", "B" and "B1" indicated in Figure 1.

P.26 Table 3: The orientation of the table should be adjusted because some data could not be shown clearly.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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