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Reviewer’s report:

It would have been much more convenient for me as reviewer, when the authors would have highlighted their changes as it is usually done in revised manuscripts.

Major Compulsory Revisions

Abstract: The primary endpoint and comparisons are still missing in the abstract.

Methods:
- Sample size calculation: It is not necessary to provide the formula – this is common knowledge. I asked for the rational of the assumptions which were included into the formula. It is still unclear from where the SD of 0.206 is determined, if this is based on previous data this should be referenced. In addition you provide now two times the same information about the sample size calculation (before and after the formula). I still would like to see a clear rational which support such a large effect due to the intervention as here assumed.

Statistics:
- Two group comparisons are preplanned, and the multiple testing has to be handled not only as a post hoc procedure. The authors should discuss with their statistician the options (e.g. hierarchical test procedure, Bonferroni-Holm)
- The statistical analysis should adjust for baseline values. In my opinion further covariates are only necessary if there are relevant group differences.

Minor Essential Revisions
- Methods, randomization: The block size usually should not be transparent to those who perform the trial, because this influences blinding.
- One point from my last review has not been answered by the authors: Randomization: Please provide software and who generated the sequence
- Recruitment: I don’t understand why the authors use the term “A convenience sample” if they invite patients from a computer data base they could invite a random sample which fulfills the inclusion criteria.
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Quality of written English: Acceptable
**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests