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Author’s response to reviews: see over
Authors’ Responses to the Reviewer’s Comments


We sincerely thank the Reviewer for the time it took to provide his thorough and thoughtful comments and edits to our manuscript. Please find below our responses to these comments. We have included a ‘tracked changes’ version of our manuscript which indicates the changes we made to the manuscript based on the Reviewer’s comments. We have also included a ‘clean copy’ of the manuscript (i.e., changes made and accepted without ‘track changes’ shown).

Best wishes,

Gabrielle van der Velde
Toronto, May 21, 2011

Responses to the Reviewer’s Report:

1. We have inserted [ON] after [Toronto], as suggested by the Reviewer.
2. We have inserted [Canada] after the mail code, as suggested by the Reviewer.
3. We have included this information, as suggested by the Reviewer (see below Abstract).
4. We have edited the sentence, as suggested by the Reviewer.
5. We have edited the sentence, as suggested by the Reviewer.
6. We have edited the sentence, as suggested by the Reviewer.
7. We have edited the sentence, as suggested by the Reviewer.
8. We have edited the sentence, as suggested by the Reviewer.
9. We have edited the sentence, as suggested by the Reviewer.
10. We have edited the sentence, as suggested by the Reviewer.
11. We have added a sentence describing our methods for checking the veracity of self-reported co-interventions by participants.
12. We have edited the sentence, as suggested by the Reviewer.
13. A sentence describing the measures of reliability and threshold value for acceptable agreement has been added, as recommended by the Reviewer.
14. Agreed that there are hundreds, so have inserted a general statement in brackets at the end of the sentence.
15. We have added 50%, 75% and 95% confidence levels in brackets after the words ‘confidence ellipses.
16. A reference has been added, as recommended by the Reviewer.
17. We have edited the sentence, as suggested by the Reviewer.
18. The issue that the Reviewer has raised will not be a concern since at this point in time, data collection for baseline data is nearly completed (95%) and there is no significant missing baseline data (<0.5%).
19. The problem that other approaches for dealing with missing data are equally limited. All imputation methods are flawed because there is the assumption that data are missing at random. It is for this reason that we have outlined methods for conducting sensitivity analyses to determine the robustness of the results to assumptions regarding the missing data (i.e., worst
case/best case scenarios). See the third sentence under the section heading: *Missing Data and Loss to Follow-up* (page 18 of the ‘track changes’ manuscript).

20. We have provided references for the imputation methods (References 58 and 59).
21. We have added references, as recommended by the Reviewer.
22. Thank you for your correction on our adjustment to the sample size. Yes, we did multiply the sample size by 0.30 instead of dividing it by its complement in order to achieve the additional number of individuals that we would need to recruit. Currently, our rate of drop out is significantly lower than 30%. Thus, we should have a sufficient sample to meet our sample size requirements.
23. We have edited the reference, as suggested by the Reviewer.
24. We have edited the reference, as suggested by the Reviewer.
25. We have edited the reference, as suggested by the Reviewer.
26. We have edited the reference, as suggested by the Reviewer.
27. We have edited the reference, as suggested by the Reviewer.
28. We have edited the reference, as suggested by the Reviewer.
29. We have edited the reference, as suggested by the Reviewer.
30. We have edited the reference, as suggested by the Reviewer.
31. We have edited the reference, as suggested by the Reviewer.
32. We have edited the reference, as suggested by the Reviewer.
33. We have edited the reference, as suggested by the Reviewer.
34. We have edited the reference, as suggested by the Reviewer.
35. We have edited the reference, as suggested by the Reviewer.
36. We have edited the reference, as suggested by the Reviewer.
37. We have edited the reference, as suggested by the Reviewer.
38. We have edited the reference, as suggested by the Reviewer.
39. We have edited the reference, as suggested by the Reviewer.
40. We have edited the reference, as suggested by the Reviewer.
41. We have edited the reference, as suggested by the Reviewer.
42. We have edited the reference, as suggested by the Reviewer.
43. We have edited the reference, as suggested by the Reviewer.
44. We have edited the reference, as suggested by the Reviewer.
45. We have edited the reference, as suggested by the Reviewer.