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Depressive symptoms during rehabilitation period predict poor outcome of lumbar spinal stenosis surgery: a 2-year perspective

Sanna Sinikallio, Soili M Lehto, Timo Aalto, Olavi Airaksinen, Heikki Kröger and Heimo Viinamäki

To the Editorial Office,

Referring to your e-mail of 8th June 2010, we have made minor revisions to our manuscript. Please also see in detail our response to Reviewer 1.

With these revisions, we resubmit our manuscript for your kind consideration and hope that our manuscript will now merit publication in BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders.

Respectfully, on behalf of all the authors

Sanna Sinikallio, PhD
Kuopio University Hospital
Department of Rehabilitation
Tarinan sairaala
71800 Siilinjärvi
Finland
e-mail: sanna.sinikallio@kuh.fi

Responses to Rev. 1 (Kevin Spratt)

Remove all ns notation for non-significant and include the observe p value.
We have now added the observed p-values in Tables 3 and 4.

As I was not the only reviewer who questioned the author’s decision to omit non-statistically significant results from tables, I would prefer that these data be incorporated in the tables and that the N counts and rates associated with the ORs also be reported. However, if the journal has a policy that allows non-statistically significant results to be suppressed, I would withdraw this as a compulsory revision.

At this point we kindly refrain from adding any new data to the tables. In the manuscript we have reported our results using notations that are generally used and accepted in this area of research.

As we have added several new tables and data in the revision process of the paper, we feel that at this point, adding more statistical particulars is unlikely to bring any additional value, and could result not only in unnecessarily expanding the length of the paper, but also in a loss of focus.