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**Reviewer's report:**

Minor Essential Revisions

Overall, the manuscript reads much better but there are still a number of issues that need to be addressed before publication.

2.1. If the participants with <40 degrees were excluded then it should be stated in the methods section under inclusion/exclusion criteria.

3.12. The authors wrote “While the primary endpoint was 24 weeks, participants underwent interim clinical review after 8 weeks, at which time they were asked to complete again the pain subscale of the FFI. Further postal FFI (pain) questionnaires were administered, and telephone reviews were conducted, at 12 weeks as well as at the 24 week end-point.”

Figure 3 shows the results from baseline, 8, 12 and 24 weeks but the results not reported. If data was collected, as stated in the methodology then should not the results be produced?

4.2 Still states 10 not nine participants. Please re-check.

6.1. The comment “The difference was similar to those of 30mm [28] and 32mm [45] previously reported to represent an adequate analgesic response to treatment” . Please can you clarify the above statement as I believe the readership will not grasp the relevance of the statement?
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