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*BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine*

Editorial Manager

Dear Sir\Madam,

Thank you for the second review of our paper, entitled, “Efficacy of methylsulfonylmethane supplementation on osteoarthritis of the knee: a randomized controlled study”.

Below is a point-by-point response to each point raised by each reviewer. The changes in the manuscript itself are highlighted in yellow as well as cited below. We also ensured that the manuscript complies fully with the journal guidelines.

We thank you again for the reconsideration of our work.

Sincerely yours,

Ronen Debi, MD
Reviewer 1:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. Please add the stat method used in your footnote (T2). (ITT with LOCF method).

The following was added to the footnote of Table 2:

“Intention to treat analysis was carried out with the last observation carried-forward method.”

2. There may be something wrong about page 15, line 25 and page 16, line 1. Please consider.

We agree. As per this question and question 5, we removed these lines from the manuscript.

Removed: “The results of the study may have also been improved had a greater number of patients been enrolled to the study. These issues limit the power of the present study.”

3. Age was not significant different between 2 groups (page 27, line 7).

Thank you for point this out. “Age” was removed from page 27, line 7.

4. Figure 1 should have figure legend. It will be better if authors separated FU to be 6 and 12 weeks, and give detail why patients lost FU at each interval.

The legend for Figure 1 was added accordingly. In addition, the follow-up in the figure was separated into 6 week and 12 week follow-ups.

5. Authors answered reviewer’s question that they have calculated sample size. That means it’s sufficient to answer the research question. Why they mentioned about increasing number of patients will improve the results of the study? (page 15, line 25)

We agree. As per this question and question 2, we removed these lines from the manuscript.

Removed: “The results of the study may have also been improved had a greater number of patients been enrolled to the study. These issues limit the power of the present study.”
Reviewer 3:

Discussion

1. Paragraph 7-“There is a good change” was meant to be “There is a good “chance”.

Thank you for pointing this out. This was changed.

2. Paragraph 9-why not report the VAS for pain as 17mm to be in comparison to the other measures reported in this paragraph rather than the 0.17cm as reported.

We agree. This change was made.