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Author’s response to reviews: see over
Dear Professor Altman,

Thank you very much for the helpful reviewers’ comments. We have modified the manuscript in the light of these suggestions, and list these in detail below:

Title: MAVIDOS Maternal Vitamin D Osteoporosis Study: Trial rationale and methodology
Version: 4
Date: 13 December 2011
Reviewer: Charlie Goldsmith
Reviewer's report:
The answers to the issues raised in the last review were generally well handled. However, there are some issues that still should be made clear in the manuscript.

1. Page 2, ISRCT number. Please clarify the date format. Is it November 4 2008, or is it April 11 2008. To make this clear either state the format as mm/dd/yyyy or dd/mm/yyyy. However, the more common date format now is like all other numbers and goes from largest to smallest as yyyy/mm/dd as 2008/11/04 or 2008/04/11 whichever is correct. This last format can also be extended to hours, minutes and seconds. Another option is 2008 Nov 04 or 2008 Apr 11 and this is also common to be clear to a reader. There was no answer to date the first patient was randomized. Please insert that date if this has already happened. If not state when it is planned. Also P 3, paragraph 1, l 2.

We have corrected the date format, and also inserted the date for the first participant randomisation.

2. P 10, p 1, line 5. The symbol for degrees did not come through on my copy.
3. P 10, p 2, l 2. Delete the [] after [UK].
4. P 12, p 2, l 9. Replace [This] by [The urine sample]. Presumably this is what is intended.
5. P 13, p 1, l 1 and 2. Provide a Reference for the phantom calibration.
6. P 17, p 3, l 2. Delete [In order] and capitalize [To] as the words are redundant in English.
7. P 18, p 4, l 5. Delete the sentence [Analyses ... process.] since no blocking is intended in the trial. Also replace [T] by [T].
8. P 19, p 2, l 3. Delete [and/].
We have amended the manuscript accordingly and clarified the phantom calibration which is performed according to the manufacturer's instructions.

10. P 22. The authors should check that all short forms are included. This reviewer found that: [Alb, BA, BMC, BRU, Ca, COMA, DBP, GmHR, IOV, IQ, LMP, MHSO, NICE, SACN, SUHT, SWS, UK, USA, UVB and VBP] were excluded.
We apologise that there were some omissions here. We have rechecked and amended the list.

11. P 26, R 30, l 1. Delete the space to read [Policy.] and on l 3, delete [Ref Type: Report]
We have made these corrections.

We hope that this paper will now be suitable for publication in Trials. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Nicholas C Harvey MA MB BChir MRCP PhD
Senior lecturer and Honorary Consultant Rheumatologist