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Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Publication of the following article: “The prevalence of pain and disability one year post fracture of the distal radius in a UK population: A cross sectional survey”.

I submit the following amendments to be considered for publication in BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders. Please find enclosed the following:

Manuscript: "moore2008manuscriptamendments" (this contains two documents one which has the amendments highlighted page 1 - 25 and one which is with the amendments in with no highlight page 26 onwards. I hope this is correct for you to accept?)
Tables 1, 2 and 3: "moore2008table1amended", "moore2008table2amended" and "moore2008table3"
Figures 1 and 2: "moore2008figure1amended" and "moore2008figure2amended"

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the reviewers for their comments. My responses are as follows:

Reviewer: Allen Donner

Major comment:

Page 16. The sentence “...was sufficient to ensure.....” has been removed.

Minor comment:

Table 2: foot note amended to ‘zero cells’

Reviewer: Heinz G. Endres

Comment 1: “study design and settings” page 6 the number of participants and eligible subjects has been amended for clarity

Comment 2: 264 subjects were eligible for inclusion and sent a questionnaire but only 93 responded. A response rate of 80 was need for the sample size but more than 80 patients were targeted as we expected a poor response rate, this is explained later in the “margin for error/sample size” section on page 8.
Comment 3: the sentence “reduces the potential for responder bias…..” on page 13 has been removed.

Comment 4: A multivariate analysis on the significant univariate variables has been performed and included.

Comment 5: As a result of revisiting the data set amendments have been made. Table 1 has been amended to show the numbers and the missing values. The percentages shown are the percentage based on the data available (i.e. with the missing data not included) and not a percentage as a proportion of the 93 respondents. I can amend this to show them as a proportion of the 93 respondents if preferred.

Table 2 data has been scrutinised again and the data sets re-run for accuracy. There was an error in the original table for which I can only apologise (this data set has not been looked at for over one year) I have therefore, amended the rest of the manuscript accordingly.

Table 3 has been added to show the multivariate analysis

Figure 1 has been amended to show counts and the prevalence rate calculated from this by not including missing values.

Figure 2 has been amended to show counts and the prevalence rate calculated from this by not including missing values.

Reviewer: Jesse Jupiter

Comment 1: Author response. A VAS score as a number is meaningless in this study and has been re-interpreted as categories as explained on page 7 (methods, analysis) the sentence on page. This has been clarified on page 11.

Comment 2: Unfortunately it is not possible to analyse the characteristics of the subjects in the major pain and disability groups as the numbers are too small. It is recognised that this would be a beneficial thing to be able to do.

Reviewer: Ruby Grewal

Page 2 paragraph 1: changed as suggested
Page 2 paragraph 3: changed as suggested
Page 2 paragraph 3: Medication usage changed to pain medication for wrist as this is what the questionnaire asked. This has been amended throughout the document.
Page 4 paragraph 2: Amended as suggested.
Page 5 paragraph 1: Thank you for highlighting this error, this has been amended throughout
Page 5 paragraph 2: sentence amended
Page 6 paragraph 1: changed as suggested
Page 6 paragraph 1: changed as suggested
Page 6 paragraph 2: changed as suggested
Page 6 paragraph 3: clarified as suggested
Page 8 paragraph 2: clarified as suggested
Page 8 paragraph 2: Clarified in the text but as the population of left handed people would have been only 9 people from the sample this was not enough to put into a chi-square. I hope this is clearer?

Page 8 paragraph 3: changed as suggested
Page 9 paragraph 1: All were injured a year before the start of the study as explained on page 6 paragraph 1. Please advise if more clarity is required.
Page 9 paragraph 2: Thank you for spotting this error. The data has been revisited and the manuscript adjusted accordingly on page 10 paragraph 1.
Page 10 paragraph 2: changed as suggested now page 10 paragraph 3.
Page 10 paragraph 3: amended on table 1
Page 11 paragraph 3: This is an interesting comment but the medical documentation was insufficient to be able to explore this. This was discussed briefly on page 17 paragraph 2.
Page 13 paragraph 2: changed as suggested
Page 15 paragraph 1: clarified as suggested
Page 18 paragraph 1 clarified as suggested
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