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Reviewer's report:

General

Thankyou for the opportunity to review this revised manuscript. The paper has been extensively revised and is now much clearer than the previous manuscript.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

In the final section of the Background, where the aims or research questions are laid out, I suggest adding to the second question - perhaps rather than just writing "(2) how effective is this?" the authors might like to expand this to "(2) how effective is this intervention?".

Table 2 still needs a little bit of revision. Can the authors add a brief explanation in the key explaining what the values are (i.e. means and SDs or medians and IQRs) as they have in Table 1. It is a little confusing the way it is with no explanation. In addition, change all 95% CIs so there is a 'to' between the lower and upper limit (i.e. 0 to 4), rather than using a comma. Finally, the authors have reported the DAS and HAQ scores in Table 2 down to 2 decimal places. I'm not very familiar with these instruments, however does this provide an unrealistic level of precision in the result. The confidence interval is only reported to one decimal place, which may be better. [This would apply to the reporting of these figures in Table 1 as well.]

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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