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Reviewer’s report:

This qualitative and purely descriptive study was aimed at assessing the psychological impact of Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT) as a support therapy administered to caregivers (a total number of 23 caregivers was interviewed here) of patients with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis and progressive muscular atrophy. The outcome of these interviews shows that ACT made caregivers more aware of their role and the difficulties associated with that role, and that caregivers generally perceived the therapy as a useful support. It is concluded that ACT has a positive effect as a "product" administered to the caregivers of patients with the pathology stated.

The article is clearly written, but this reviewer here is unsure of whether it is suitable for BMC Psychology. The paper does not deliver any deeper insight into the underlying psychological process that has led to the declared "raised awareness" and "acceptance of problems associated with the role" in the caregivers. The results reported here do therefore not allow the reader to understand why ACT as a specific support tool, with explicit steps and procedures, and with clear targets in limited time, has achieved something that other forms of (online or other) psychological support could not have achieved.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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