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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for getting the opportunity to review this article. Below are my comments and concerns.

1. The research question is interesting, however in the introduction it would be good to discuss the meaning of quality of life in the recovery process. Also a comment on the theoretical basis of the instrument would be valuable in order to understand the type of QoL that is measured. What kind of changes are expected?

2. Rand 36 is a well validated instrument and though a good choice to measure the quality of life

3. My major concern in the article is the quality of the data. It seems to me that the sample is convenience and the sample sizes of each group are very small. These should be better justified in the methods section. Why was this sample size chosen, where did the n of 50 patients in each group come from?

4. The reporting style is clear but somewhat superficial. e.g. it is mentioned that the Change in QoL was clinically relevant. How was this evaluated or what was the basis for this kind of comment?

5. The authors have discussed the limitations of the study quite honestly, but the title of the article gives a different picture. Since the results cannot be generalised outside this group, the title should be changed to a milder one.
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