Dear editor,

We are delighted that our manuscript has been conditionally accepted for publication in BMC Cancer. We would like to thank the referees for thoroughly reviewing our manuscript. Their comments have greatly improved the paper.

Below you will find our response on a point-by-point basis. The paper has also been checked according to the BMC’s author guidelines.

Kind regards,
Caro van Uden

Reviewer #1, A. Voogd

1) “sever” has been replaced by “severe” (page 6, line 9)
2) “mobility” has been removed from the sentence “Both shoulder flexion and abduction had increased in the intervention group” (page 6, line 31)
3) The referee is right that this was a rather confusing sentence. We changed this into: “The researcher was successfully blinded for treatment allocation of patients; in 60% of the cases treatment allocation was guessed correctly.” (page 7, line 23)
4) “commonly” has been replaced by “commonly” (page 7, line 23)
5) It has been clarified to which authors the phrase “However, the authors suggest that applying” refers (Kärki et al. 2001). (page 8, line 27)
6) We adopted the suggestion of the referee: “Besides the small sample size, a limitation of the study” (page 10, line 1).
7) We adopted the referee’s suggestion to change line 11 on page 9 to: “However, Voogd et al. (2003) found that physiotherapy is often prescribed during follow-up, especially among patients with edema and restricted shoulder function.”
function [6].

8) We mentioned the most useful endpoints (to our opinion) and the sentence has been changed to: Larger studies with at least a 1-year follow-up with relevant outcome measures, such as shoulder function, pain, quality of life and edema are needed. (page 9, line 14)

9) In cells without any observations we have put a 0 (table 1 and 2)

Reviewer #2, P. Christiansen

The reviewer had made no comments.