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To
Dr Christina Chap, PhD
Senior Executive Editor
BMC-series
BioMed Central
236 Gray's Inn Road
London WC1X 8HB

1st January, 2013

Dear Dr Chap,

Re: MS: 1732251082784673 - A mixed exercise training programme is feasible and improves quality of life and muscle strength in multiple myeloma survivors

Thank you for inviting us to re-submit our manuscript (again).

We have now addressed the points you have requested. In particular, we have:

1. Changed the title of the paper, to “A mixed exercise training programme is feasible and safe and may improve quality of life and muscle strength in multiple myeloma survivors”
2. Included a section in the Discussion: “Our study was designed as a single arm pilot study, which clearly presents limitations when interpreting the results. In particular, because subjects are compared only to themselves previously, this design does not allow us to conclude that the improvements in patient reported and objective outcomes are necessarily due to the intervention. It is possible that patients would have experienced improvements in these parameters over time. A comparator group of patients, in a randomized study, is required to answer this question.”
3. Replaced the sentence “An important finding is that fatigue levels were significantly improved by the EP” with the following: “A potentially important finding is the improvement in fatigue levels following the EP. Because of the limitations of a single arm study, we cannot conclude that this is due to the EP, however, these findings warrant further investigation.”
4. Replaced the sentence in the concluding paragraph in the Discussion
“Preliminary results from this single arm study suggest significant benefits in
patient-rated and objective outcomes, these await confirmation in randomised
trials.” with “The findings in this single arm study await urgent
confirmation in a randomised trial to evaluate the benefits of exercise
intervention as rehabilitation in these patients.”

Our paper now includes requisite and appropriate nuance regarding the conclusions
of the study, and we believe that we have included and discussed relevant literature.
I have uploaded our reviewed manuscript, with the salient changes marked in red.

We sincerely hope that you will now find our paper suitable for publication in your
journal.

Yours sincerely,

Kwee Yong
Professor of Haematology and Honorary Consultant