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Dear Editor

Thank you for sending us these two reviews again. Reviewer 3 however does not ask for any changes to the manuscript, so there is no need for us to respond with any changes. Reviewer 2 again presses us for calculations on effect size, which as previously stated, we do not understand how this can be possibly done. Last time we took advice from a statistician who supported our view. This time we have taken advice from another statistician who is a well known international psychometrician and this is what he said;

“the effect size measures require two sets of data which it sounds like you don't have in the transition scale (i.e., it sounds like that's just a "how much have you changed?" measure). The most common effect size is the standardized mean difference (the difference between scores divided by the pooled standard deviation of both pre-intervention and post-intervention scores). Even if you used your transition scale as a measure of the difference (i.e., the numerator) you still have no way of calculating a pooled standard deviation because you have only one set of scores. The odds ratio, by definition is based on a 2x2 contingency table and it sounds like at best you have only one side of that table given that you don't have baseline data associated with the transition measure.”

Thus, once again we feel at a loss as to how to respond to the reviewer. We did indeed check the Cochrane source as suggested, but this did not illuminate a solution to the issue. In the last revision of the manuscript we clearly showed how the ORIDL is scored – i.e., there is no baseline measure, just a change score, thus we have no idea how we can possibly do an odds ratio, as the statistician above also states.

We have inserted details of the ethics committee in the methods section on page 5, along with the consent issue raised.

We hope the paper can now be accepted.

Yours sincerely

Stewart Mercer

On behalf of all authors