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Reviewer's report:

It is usual practice to state in the response letter how each of the issues raised in the last review were handled; not provide a global answer, and then not do all what was claimed. If the authors disagree with a recommendation, they should make a case as to why they chose not to deal with the issue. Reviewers spend too much time to make specific points to improve protocols and papers for authors to dismiss them with a global comment as was done in the most recent reply from the authors.

New issues not properly handled from the last review.

1. The intent of the recommendation about CONSORT was to provide the reference and state that it would be followed when the trial is reported.

2. P(age) 5, p(aragraph) 4, l(ine) 2. Delete [s] from [believes] to read [believe].

3. P 14, p 1, l 2. Insert [)] after [[81]].


5. P 16, p 3, l 4. If there was one focus group, insert [a] after the first [on].

6. For all the R(eference)s where there is a translated title, the language should be written at the end of the citation, not after the translation. See P 20, R 6, 14, 17; P 21, R 36, 40; P 23, R 76.

7. P 20, R 9 is still incomplete. Also P 22, R 47.

8. P 21, R 40. Who produced this R

9. P 22, R 55. Include the phrase: date of last access Also date and phrase for P 23, R 70.

10. P 22, R 59. Periods are not needed after the initials.

11. P 26, Table 3, 14th dash. Should there be an n in the first word: Alternation, as it seems it should be: Alteration. This was in the last list as well.