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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
None

Minor Essential Revisions
1. Was there any assessment of the use of individual therapies in each of the three treatment arms? For example, although allowed in G1, did providers actually use SMT or massage at a rate that makes this group is sufficiently different from the comparator groups? This information seems fundamental to your study question.

2. P5: Please clarify the contrast between the parent RCT and the overall aim of this study (described in the last paragraph of the Background as “the occurrence and severity of AE after naprapathic manual therapy”, and then in the second paragraph of the Design section as “the secondary objective”).

3. P6: Exclusion criteria #7, what is meant by “requiring” in requiring/refusing spinal…? It would seem requiring the treatment is met by the exclusion criteria #9.

4. P7. Provide a reference for the contraindications for SMT according to the Swedish Board of Social Welfare.

5. P10: What were the methods for collecting serious AE (it is reported in results that there were none, but I only see methods for classifying minor versus moderate)?

6. P15: The number of therapists participating belongs in the results section.

7. P15: blinded randomization, data collection, and quality management should be noted in the results section.

8. P18: any difference in baseline and demographic characteristics among your pilot sample, which was then merged with the large sample?

9. Figure 1: missing “n” for Age, 18 or >65 years.

Discretionary Revisions
1. P11: What is meant by “controlling” the data input of baseline and AE questionnaires? Does this mean quality control, and if so, how was that conducted?

2. Table 2: Use “0” instead of “-” if the dash is meant to denote zero. If it is
missing data, indicate so.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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