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Reviewer's report:

Yoga for managing knee osteoarthritis in older women: A feasibility study

The manuscript is much improved and the authors have done a very good job of addressing the reviewers’ critiques. Nevertheless, I found the analyses which combined the intervention and wait list control groups confusing. I think that the authors must determine what their primary goal of the pilot is and then analyze their data accordingly. Is it to compare yoga to nothing/usual care (as in a randomized trial)? Or, do they wish to assess changes in outcomes without a control group (as in a pre-post design without a control group – as their analyses which combine the two groups seem to do)? My second major concern is that much of the discussion tries to explain/justify why results for certain outcomes were inconclusive. This seems at odds with the pilot/feasibility nature of the study, as it was not powered to detect statistically significant or clinically important differences for outcomes of interest. Consider revising so that discussion more logically follows from the study aims as presented in the introduction.

Minor suggestions/comments:

- Please clarify what the time points are. I am still confused about whether the “12 weeks follow-up” is 20 weeks after baseline or 12 weeks after baseline. Please clarify.
- P8, 2nd line: “furthered” should be “further”
- P9. Please explain how the study quality was monitored by the research mentors
- P10, line 1: What unit of distance does the “8” refer to? Is it 8 meters? Please write it out to reduce confusion.
- Results, p12. The authors state that “among the 180 potential participants contacted …” , however, in their methods, they explained that multiple methods were used to recruit participants, including hanging flyers. Therefore, it does not seem possible to know the denominator, meaning the number of potential participants who were contacted. It may be more clear to report the number that were mailed letters, while specifying (if this is known) what number of those screened learned about the study from the mailed letter rather than other means. If the recruitment source for the people who contacted the study is not known, consider revising the first sentence of the results.
- P14. The authors describe Table 1 as showing differences, but it means and SD/ranges are shown.
- P14, 1st full paragraph. Please reference Table 2.
- P15, last paragraph. Please explain what numbers are presented in parentheses. Ranges?
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