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Reviewer's report:

The pages were numbered from 1 to 24.

The following comments are offered to improve the manuscript.

1. Page 2, paragraph 2, line 3. It seems as though a word is missing, could it be [symptoms] between [spinal] and [for]?

2. Page 2, last line. Insert the date of registration and if it has happened, the date the first patients was randomised.

3. Page 3, paragraph 3, line 1. Incidence is the rate with which a non diseased person becomes diseased over a specific time interval, such as 1 year. Either state the time or use an alternative terms such as [rate]. Also Page 5, paragraph 1, line 3 and 5. Also Page 17, paragraph 4, line 2. Also Page 18, paragraph 1, line 2.

4. Page 6, paragraph 3, lines 3 and 4. Since [or] logically includes [and] delete [and/] or rewrite as [… neck pain, mid-back pain or low back pain)].

5. Page 7, paragraph 1, line 2. Replace [significant] by [important]. Also Page 7, bullet 2, line 4.

6. Page 7, bullet 2, line 2. Replace [significant] by [clinically important].

7. Page 8, paragraph 3, line 3. Insert [using a 1:1 allocation] after [groups].


9. Page 11, paragraph 3, lines 1 to 3. It should be mentioned how this will be done. Dore and Altman suggest it should be a clinical judgment, not statistical testing.


11. Page 15, paragraph 2, line 1. You should also look at the Sackett paper that suggests measuring blinding is futile. Sackett DL: Commentary: Measuring the success of
12. P 15, p 4, l 9. If software was used to compute the sample size, reference it. No mention is made to expand the sample size to accommodate dropouts and how you plan to handle missing data.


15. P 17, p 1, l 5 and 6. How will this be done?

16. P 17, p 2, l 1. Has the BI been validated? If so cite the validation study. Also look at Sackett in 11 above.

17. P 18, p 2, l 12. Suggest deleting [appropriate] until the questionnaire has been validated and is citable.


A random sample of 10 Rs was checked for citation accuracy. Also, this reviewer likes to see issue numbers as they make finding the R easier for a reader.


22. P 20, R 6, l 3. Insert [(2)] after [31].

23. P 20, R 9. The date of last access should be noted here, and which R of the many on the website would be the best R.

24. P 20, R 17 could not be verified. More details should be given.

25. P 21, R 20, l 1. Add another author [Hay EM] after [Foster NE,]. Also on l 3, insert [(5)] after [59].

26. P 21, R 25. Insert the date of last access.


29. P 22, R 33, l 2. Delete [Feb] and on l 3, insert [(4)] after [144].

30. P 22, R 34, l 2. Insert [(3)] after [17].

31. P 22, R 35, l 1. There are 3 authors: [Bang H, Ni L, Davis CE]; and on l 2, insert [(2)] after [25].

32. P 22, R 36, l 3. Insert [(12)] after [89].
33. P 22, R 38 is correct.

34. P 23, Figure 1, Row 4 boxes. The left and right boxes on l 1 should use [n] instead of [N].