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Author’s response to reviews:

List of changes – R3

Editor Comments:

In addition to addressing the points raised by reviewer 3, there are some stylistic points that should also be addressed at this point:

1) Change in the order of the authorship: in this revision, the first and second authors have been swapped. In view of this, please could you complete a Change in Authorship form. A link to the form can be found at: https://www.biomedcentral.com/getpublished/editorial-policies#authorship

This should be completed and signed by all authors (please note electronic signatures are not acceptable).
Author’s response: The completed and by all authors signed Change in Authorship form were attached to this revision.

Changes done in the manuscript: none

Lines: none

2) The title page and the Figure legends should not be provided as supplementary files but instead should be included within the main Word file. For the title page, please ensure that the email addresses of all authors are provided.

Author’s response: Changes done accordingly.

Changes done in the manuscript: Title page and Figure legends were included in the main Word file.

Lines: 1 – 64 and 447 - 475

3) Figure 1: please could you indicate whether the images has been published previously or are produced solely for this paper.

Author’s response: Changes done accordingly.

Changes done in the manuscript: We added the following sentences to the Figure legend 1: The images were produced solely for this manuscript.

Lines: 454 - 455
4) Ethical approval and consent to participate: please provide the full name of the local ethics committee

Author’s response: Changes done accordingly.

Changes done in the manuscript: We added the full name of the local ethics committee at the Material and Methods section.

Lines: 322 - 323

5) Authors contributions: please advise whether all of the authors have been (i) involved in drafting the manuscript or revising it critically for important intellectual content; (ii) given final approval of the version to be published; (iii) and agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Author’s response: Changes done accordingly.

Changes done in the manuscript: The change was made as suggested.

Lines: 339 - 343

6) Track changes should be removed and an unmarked Word file provided (along with the figure files)

Author’s response: Changes done accordingly.

Changes done in the manuscript: none

Lines: none
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Reviewer reports:

Andreas Fottner (Reviewer 1):

The limited sample size of 24 patients was still not changed, but since this limitation is mentioned in the discussion section it should be okay with me.

Author`s response: Thank you.

Changes done in the manuscript: none.

Lines: none.

Lennart Scheys (Reviewer 3):

In case the authors solve the remaining issue mentioned below this paper can be accepted for publication.

1/ Prior Comment No 11:

I wrongfully suggested "empirically" instead of "pragmatically". Obviously I meant pragmatically, so please adjust accordingly.
Author’s response: Changes done accordingly.

Changes done in the manuscript: The change was made as suggested.

Lines: 203

2/ Prior Comment:

"Furthermore, and more importantly, I still miss a clear indication towards the readers of the confidence you have in your data in view of the small sample size. This should be overcome by reporting confidence intervals for your outcome parameters as those typically take into account the number of samples. Author's response: 95% CI Intervals are now provided"

=> Please also add CI's for the correlation values as these are your primary outcome parameters.

Author’s response: Changes done accordingly. The 95% confidence intervals for Spearman correlation coefficients were estimated with the help of Fisher Z-transformation.

Changes done in the manuscript: The change was made as suggested.

Lines: 486 - 487

3/ Prior Comment:

"Finally, your correlation analysis suffers from quite a big multiple testing problem as a total of 18x2=36 correlation analyses were performed which should be corrected for."

=> How did you come up with a change to 0.01? Was this pragmatically chosen? If so, why do you think this would suffice to eliminate your chances of mistakenly assuming significance for any of the many analyses performed? Add this info also in your manuscript. Finally, your explanation in the text is not clear or correct and should read "... to compensate for the multiple testing in our statistical setup".

Author’s response: We agree. We consulted an independent and external statistician. We were advised to reduced the number of statistical tests, in particular since the focus of our study was
not to compare the strength of correlations over time. We have therefore limited our correlation analysis to the 6-month follow-up time point. At this time point we had not only assessed PROs, but also the notch. Given the substantially lower number of statistical tests in the revised version, we consider the alpha-level of 0.01 now to be adequate. Additionally, we deleted Figure 6 and 7.

Changes done in the manuscript: The change was made as suggested.

Lines: 82, 164, 211-212, 221-222, 270-272, 291,

4/ Finally, please have your recent edits carefully proofread as there are some remaining typo's and textual errors

Author’s response: We agree.

Changes done in the manuscript: Multiple typo’s and textual errors were corrected.