Author's response to reviews

Title: Cognitive, fear-reducing information or individual symptom-based physical training in chronic LBP. A pragmatic, randomized, controlled trial with 1-year follow-up.

Authors:

Pia H Sorensen (piahavn@hotmail.dk)
Tom Bendix (tbendix@health.sdu.dk)
Claus Manniche (claus.manniche@slb.regionsyddanmark.dk)
Lars Korsholm (korsholmlars@gmail.com)
Dorte Lemvigh (dorte.lemvigh@slb.regionsyddanmark.dk)
Aage Indahl (aage.indahl@rehabilitering.net)

Version: 2 Date: 1 April 2010

Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear BMC and referees.

We have now thoroughly been working with all your comments. We are extremely pleased to have had such careful assessments and having got so many suggestions on improvements, which have really lifted the article. Thanks a lot!

We know that there is no limitation in BMC, but still we had been striving to not making the article too long: It is well known that: the longer the article is, the fewer readers. We still go for such principle, but have realized that some extension was needed to accommodate most of the referees comments. Especially for the clarification of our non-injury, cognitive model, a certain expansion has taken place, because several referee comments told us that this issue was not explained satisfactorily. And we agree.

However, with so many comments it would be impossible to follow all of them because this would make the article extremely long.

All suggestions/queries have been commented upon with RED CAPITAL LETTERS after each comment.

Changes have been written with blue letters, except evident smaller language improvements.

‘Disability’ has been replaced by ‘activity limitations’ according to CONSORT.

Also, the sequence of the outcome and discussion elements have been changed to be identical over the various chapters. Now, the sequence of outcomes and additional measures to illustrate treatment aspects have got the same courses during Method, Results and Tables, and also grouped more logically. This is an evident improvement, and especially thanks to rev #1 for this input! Also the sequence of COG – TRAIN has been the same during the entire article, but not indicated with blue color.

This is also the explanation that numbering of Table 4 and 5 have been exchanged.

We agree that it was not clear which role e.g. number of treatments within the project had. Has been clarified.

We are embarrassed realizing that we have used data that were not quite sufficiently checked, although we had done so several times. We have thoroughly been through the data and calculations again, and found some minor changes, although not altering any conclusions. We have chosen to report all p-values <.001 as such.

We will be happy to let our professional language editor go through it, but will prefer doing so when we are sure that the (almost) final edition is reached.

Kind regards

- on behalf of the authors

Tom Bendix