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30 April, 2013

Dear The Biomed Central Editorial Team

Re: MS: 1957577890856926 Perceived Benefits and Barriers to Exercise for Recently Treated Patients with Multiple Myeloma: A Qualitative Study

Thank you for consideration of our manuscript for publication in your journal. We have reviewed the manuscript according to the reviewers’ comments which are addressed below. A copy of the amended manuscript with track changes and a clean copy are attached.

Thank you again and we look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Regards

Melinda Craike

Reviewer # 1

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1) Several responses to the reviewers question refer to page 28. But there you find only the reference list.

All of the page numbers that were quoted in responses to the reviewer’s questions referred to the track changes copy of the document (not the clean copy). Page 28 on the track changes was pages 23-24 on the clean copy.

2) It is a substantial weakness that the authors are not willing to include more information (percentage data) about the subgroups. I can understand that this request is not common in qualitative data reports but the manuscript will benefit and such data will also give a profound insight in physical activity behavior of MM patients.

We have given a great deal of consideration to this request, however we maintain that providing percentage data for each of the responses is not appropriate given the aims of the study and the methodology employed. We refer the reviewer to our previous comments and also would like to reiterate that the aim of this study was to examine the range of responses to prompts in an in-depth manner and not to directly elicit pre-determined responses to a series of questions. If it were the aim of the study to provide quantitative data, it would have been more appropriate to administer a questionnaire than conduct qualitative study with a series of open ended prompts.

The authors defer to the Editor on whether or not the inclusion of percentage data are necessary. Please advise.

Minor Essential Revisions:

3) The request (8) # Page 9 (f): The n and % number in the same brackets looks a bit confusing. Sort them better by using a semicolon instead of a comma.
...was not done.
This has now been completed. We apologise for our misunderstanding.

Reviewer #2

There are no major revisions.

Minor revisions

Abstract: line 46-should specify if these activities were before or after treatment.
Completed

Lines 49-52 the language/grammar could be improved.
We have reworded this section.

Line 79 - what is meant by induction regimen

This is explained in the manuscript: “This therapy comprises an induction regimen incorporating novel agents (thalidomide, bortezomib or lenalidomide) designed to preserve the capacity to harvest haematopoietic stem cells”

Lines 275 and 286 are the same
Line 286 has been removed

lines 302-307 this quote is not very helpful. I would exclude it.
This quote has been deleted.

line 464 and 309 are the same.
Line 464 has been reworded.

Line 476 second sentence should begin "We found"

Completed

line 489 should read "in this study"

Completed