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Reviewer’s report:

The authors improved the manuscript according to the suggestion. Especially the sample size calculations seem to be much more realistic.

Minor Revisions

The null hypothesis should be phrased as two sided at the moment the change is only mentioned in one direction and the alternative hypothesis should be given.

The randomization sequence is a key part of a RCT and my advice would be that the authors ask a statistician to do this with professional statistics software. It can be done in Excel, but Excel is a software which is prone to errors if someone is not so familiar with it. However, if the person who plans to do this has good knowledge in Excel this should be no problem.

I still would like to motivate you to use ANCOVA adjusted for baseline values instead of ANOVA, because there is evidence that this is the better analysis especially if the effects expected are small. Please see Vickers AJ. Statistical reanalysis of four recent randomized trials of acupuncture for pain using analysis of covariance. Clin J Pain 2004 Sep;20(5):319-23).

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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