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The Editor, BMC Neurology

Manuscript entitled ‘Enhancing cognitive-behavioural therapy for recurrent headache: Design of a randomised controlled trial’

Thank you for your email response to our submission of the above manuscript, dated 6th November. We responded to your email earlier today as follows:

Dear Editor

We do apologise about the trial registration number. It should have been a 14 digit number but one digit was omitted. The number (ACTRN12614000435684) has now been corrected in the manuscript. The link to the trial record that you have requested is: http://www.anzctr.org.au/TrialSearch.aspx?searchTxt=ACTRN12614000435684&ddlSearch=Registered

We include an attachment that contains the information that you have requested.

1. Ethical and Funding Approval Documentation
   * The attachment includes a letter pertaining to ethics approval. As you can see from the date, it is not the original letter. The original letter was sent by email and did not have a signature and was not on University letterhead. Hence we requested the letter that is attached.
   * The next six pages of the attachment are for the funding approval, showing what was sent by the funding body (NHMRC) and the response from the University.

2. Funding
The study has been externally funded by the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC), the federal government body that funds medical research in Australia (http://www.nhmrc.gov.au/). NHMRC has a rigorous system of peer review. Applications are assessed by disciplinary panels and each application is assigned a primary spokesperson and a secondary spokesperson. Assessor’s reports are prepared on each application by the primary spokesperson and two external experts in the field of the grant, usually one national and one international. The attachment includes one page on the peer review process that NHMRC uses, and more details are available on the NHMRC website. The process is extremely competitive - the final page of the attachment shows that this year the success rate was 14.95%.
3. Study status
The study has so far assessed 225 individuals for eligibility for the study and 48 participants have been randomised to one of the three arms of the study. 15 participants have completed the post-treatment assessment.

4. Related articles
No publications containing the results of this study have been published or been submitted for publication.

We will now submit our revised manuscript via your web site.

Many thanks for considering this manuscript.

Yours sincerely.

Paul

We hope that the manuscript is now acceptable for publication.

[Signature]

Professor Paul R Martin