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**Reviewer’s report:**

The manuscript provides a general description of the pilot study protocol authors intend to run with an already standardized intervention for which controlled trials are still lacking.

The manuscript is well written and language is straightforward. However, there are issues that need to be clarified before publication.

1. In general, objectives of the pilot trial are too generic and require a much better specification to justify the pilot format of this study protocol.

2. Given it is an intervention that is already regularly implemented in one of the two settings where the protocol is going to take place, it is unclear why a pilot study should be run before a full clinical trial.

3. Specifically, it is unclear how the authors plan to use information obtained on "opinions about the questionnaires and satisfaction with the intervention" for the design of the full clinical trial.

4. Please be more specific about how the sample is going to be selected and what clinical evaluations will be used to select patients for the study. The way it is currently written, it gives the impression patients will be selected on the basis of self-report measures but I do not believe that is going to be the case.

5. Please clarify when conditions A and B will receive standard treatment. If standard treatment is initiated during the wait-list period this group may not configure a wait-list group after all.

6. The description of standard treatment under condition B but not under condition A is confusing. Will both groups receive concomitant standard treatment?

7. Please describe how patients who receive CBT during the study protocol will be dealt with during analysis.

8. Statistics is described as if it were an efficacy trial; please describe statistics compatible with this pilot study.
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