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1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
The question is reasonably clear

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?

Design
This has been amended satisfactorily

Sample and power
These points were all answered satisfactorily, apart from:

Is a 10% difference in the (overall?) SF36 the standard difference for clinical significance?
It is usual to base sample sizes on differences that might be clinically significant. It would be useful if the authors could add a sentence to explain why they chose a 10% difference for their study

Instrument
This is explained satisfactorily

Data collection
This is clarified satisfactorily

Tables
The point made about the inappropriate use of significance tests to describe participant characteristics does not just relate to trials – they are inappropriate for any study design. Descriptive statistics are sufficient, as the intent is not to infer the sample characteristics to the population, but to describe them to allow for the reader to assess their likely similarity.

ALL THE ABOVE ARE ESSENTIAL REVISIONS

3. Are the data sound?
Yes, once the final issues above are addressed

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Again, this depends on the final amendments

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
The amendments made are satisfactory

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Yes

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes, with a few remaining grammatical and spelling errors

Conclusions
I am pleased to see these revisions, and I wish the authors well with the paper
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