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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editor-in-Chief: BMC Medical Research Methodology

Thank you for your consideration of my paper. I revised the manuscript according to the comments by the reviewers. Below is the detail of revisions. Pages (P) and lines (L) are relative to the revised version. Line numbers are reported as they are displayed in the status bar of the MS-Word environment.

Response to Roger L Lewis

1. Details of steps necessary to generate a randomization sequence and implementing randomization was addressed in the revised manuscript (P 3, L 3 - 9).

2. In advance generation of an entire sequence versus JIT method was further clarified (P 3, L 16 - 26).

3. The comment regarding the regeneration of a same sequence over again as with the Randomization.com was addressed (P 5, L 13 - 15).

4. The problem during installation of the software was inherent to the MS Visual Basic Programming Language. This problem has been addressed by the Microsoft and a remedy for it has been proposed. I prepared the installation package using newer service package of the Microsoft and the problem solved. However Windows 2000 (or XP) users still may experience a minor problem during installation which was addressed in the manuscript (P 6, L 41 to P 7 L 3).

5. The problem of downloading may be due to the communicating line of the server. I uploaded the package on another server and added the link to the manuscript (P6, L 39 - 40).

6. Unnecessary information in the introduction concerning basic justification for randomization were replaced by a comparison of the characteristics of currently available softwares and services and comparison with this software (P 3, L 33 to P 4 L 9). Screen shots of the software were added to guide the user through the use of the software. Although these figure are in color (as I was unable to produce a qualified B&W view) it can be reproduced in B&W during the process of publication (of course if not rejected).

7. Language corrections were performed with the aid of some English editors.

Response to Damian M Centegard

1. I made my effort to improve the punctuation and grammar by seeking the help of some English editors.

2. Details of random number generator of the product were addressed (P 5, L 1 - 18).

3. Limitation of existing products were detailed to explain the advantages (e.g. the advantages of having flexible UIs) of the program (P 3, L 33 to P 4 L 9)

4. Some sections were revised for the incorrect report about Randomization.com (P 2, L 5 - 7, P 3, L 36 - 39).
5. Missing labels on figures...: The submitted manuscript had not any explicit figure or table. However some parts may resemble figures or table which in fact are inline text material (P 5, P 6). Some figures were added to the revised manuscript which are associated with their labels.

6. I was not able to understand why the plural of software is not softwares. This problem was not addressed by my English editors.

7. Other punctuation and grammar issues were corrected.

8. Limitation of the software were implicitly declared: "Parallel Group Randomized Trials" was added to the end of the title. The limitation of regenerating the same sequence (P 5, L 13 - 15). Also in the discussion and conclusion it was explicitly expressed (P 6, L 22 - 24, P 6, L 32 - 34).

9. The error in abstract regarding sealed envelopes was corrected

10. Martin Bland's website was acknowledged (P 3, L 32 - 33).

The entire manuscript was formatted according to the manuscript formatting checklist and sample template.

Regards,

M. Saghaei