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Dear Editors-in-Chief,

Attached is the revised manuscript with the reviewer’s comments listed below. I addressed each concern on a point-by-point basis. Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

Sincerely,

Christine M. Goertz, DC, PhD
Palmer Center for Chiropractic Research
Reviewer's report
Title: Effect of spinal manipulation on sensorimotor functions in back pain patients: protocol for a randomized clinical trial
Version: 2 Date: 13 June 2011
Reviewer: Charlie Goldsmith
Reviewer's report:
For the most part, the responses to issues raised have been well handled. However, the issue of the minimum clinically important difference (MCID) has not been well handled. The fact that M is used is intended to be the minimum value that the investigators are using to design their study and subsequently be used to define if one arm is better than the other. It can also be used to decide if a patient has been improved from and earlier measurement. As such this should NOT be defined as an interval. So the response to Issue 35 for RMDQ should not be 2 to 3 points, but what the investigators are going to use in the study. I think they should use 2. See also point 4 below.

1. P(age) 15, p(aragraph) 1, l(ine) 3. Suggest replacing [significant] by [clinically important].

Replaced

2. P 15, p 2, l 6. Rewrite as [# 4 weeks, …].

Rewritten.


Inserted

4. P 23, p 3, l 5. Rewrite as [at 2 points …].

Rewritten.

5. P 23, p 4, l 1 and 2. If you use an 11 box scale then the upper box should be [10] not [11]. The latter will give you 12 boxes.

The upper was 10. Thank you.

6. P 24, p 1, l 3. Rewrite as [2.5 point …]. See also 4.

Rewritten

7. P 31 seems to be missing the following short forms for states in the text: [AZ, CA, MN, OH, VT].

Added.
8. P 33, R(eference) 9 seems to need more to find it. I could find it was published by Aspen Publishing in 1993 and I think the editor was Peterson DM. Is that correct?

Yes this is correct. Updated.

9. P 35, R 28, l 3. Delete [(Phila Pa 1976 )] as it has not been included in R: 33, and 37 on the same P as well as many others in the rest of the list. See also P 39, R 79, 87 and 88. See also P 40, R 91.

Deleted in all.

10. P 39, R 89, l 1. Remove the [.] from the initials of the first authors to read [Ware JE Jr.].

Removed.

11. P 44, Title, l 1. Suggest that [Range of] be deleted.

Deleted.