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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? No. the handling of the HRQL data should be improved. This is not described completely in the methods. Were the values calculated after subtraction of the baseline scores, then averaged? Were absolute values used to calculate the post-treatment means?. It is not clear. I do not see how any score can be less than zero if the score reported by the patient is presented
3. Are the data sound? They appear to be valid, high response rate However, the methods claim that only values showing greater than 10% change are clinically significant (which is generally accepted), yet the results describe in detail all the values. It would be preferable to report and discuss only the values which meet this threshold, with a statement (supported by the figures) that other values were not clinically significantly different. This would enable the reader to see the salient differences more easily
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? The discussion is too long, and focuses on other published work, not on the data. In essence, there is little difference between the two groups
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? no
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 Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?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? No. the title describes what was studied, the abstract claims significant differences, but in fact there were hardly any clinically significant differences
9. Is the writing acceptable? No. some of the English is difficult to follow. It should be revised by a native
speaker