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Reviewer’s report:

The replies to the reviewer’s comments were well handled. However, the title does not show that this set of ideas was generated for Chiropractic trials (it could be of broader use and could be encouraged in the Discussion section); maybe the title could reflect its Chiropractic nature. The authors have not agreed to share the documents they used so others might build upon their work and they could. Their review panels have not included patients and this to me is a weakness that should be recognized. Some more specific issues that should be considered:

1. P(age) 4, l(ine) 76. Replace [recent] by [2010].
2. P 4, l 77. Replace [failed to] by [did not]. Why is this a patient failure? Also P 10, l 219.
3. P 5, l 86. Insert [years] after [65]. Also P 5, l 88 after [64].
4. P 5, l 89. Include the ages here to be consistent with trials 1 and 2. Otherwise why mention the ages for them?
5. P 6, l 125. Add an [s] to read [conducts].
6. P 6, l 130. Suggest deleting [etc.] as many readers may not know what is intended. Also P 28, item 5, l 3 and second last row; both in the left column.
7. P 9, l 191. Insert [at least] before [80%].
8. P 12, l 250. Replace [ranging] by [varying].
9. P 12, l 255. Since [or] includes [and] logically, delete [and/]. Also P 15, l 322. Also P 27 row after [Need for advance …]. Also P 28 two more in right column. Also P 29, right column for [Cognitive], l 3. Also P 33, first column, box 2, l 2.
10. P 12, l 258. Replace [an] by [at least].
13. P 23 ff. Trials likes to use up to the first 30 authors before using [et al]. Add additional authors to R(eference)s 1, 2, 14, 15, 17, 21, 35.
15. P 27. Aortic aneurysm row. Insert a space to read [> 5].
16. Figure 4, right hand boxes 1, 3 and 4. There are two entries where there
should be spaces between the inequalities and the numbers for [NRS]. See 15.