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Reviewer’s report:

General

Overall this paper is much improved and now reflects the contents of the study. I have only a couple of minor comments that may improve the clarity.

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)

I noticed that the authors have removed the statement in the discussion that suggests that the study was a high quality trial. However, in the conclusion of the abstract and the main text this suggestion remains and should be removed.

The consort diagram is still confusing because it refers to numbers analysed and this should be clarified. The authors also imply that the method they used to account for missing data is a method of intention to treat analysis(page 12). An ITT analysis can be carried out with both raw data and imputed data. They seem to have mixed up the problems of missing data, non compliance(those who fill in questionnaires but don't attend or finish treatment)and imputation of data.

In the discussion (page 12) the authors state that the study was designed to investigate the effectiveness of traction. This study could not investigate the effectiveness of traction because the sample size was too small. This sentence should be re-worded e.g. this study was designed to investigate the feasibility of a trial of traction with clearly defined subgroups.

There are a couple of typographical errors in the text that need to be checked.

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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