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Reviewer's report:

Thanks for responding to my comments from the previous review. Overall the authors have done a good job with the revision - well done. My only remaining concern is still around the follow up comparisons, which I have raised in my previous 2 reviews. The manuscript now states things like "WOMAC pain and function scores and their change over the 6-month follow-up are given in table 2", "Similarly, the decrease of WOMAC pain over time" (page 9), "and their decrease over the 6-month follow-up" (page 8). But unless I am mistaken to me it still looks like the analyses have just compared 6 month follow up data, and it looks like baseline and 6-month data in the table. (not change, or alternatively, 6 month data adjusted for baseline values). For eg, see https://handbook-5-1.cochrane.org/chapter_9/9_2_3_1_the_mean_difference_or_difference_in_means.htm

Also see this recent article in BMC musculoskeletal disorders (Table 2, their figures and stats sections):

Thank you also for adding in data showing there is no difference between the groups. I suggest you reference this in the text (eg page 7, line46-51 and page 8, lines 46-51)

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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**Declaration of competing interests**
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal

Do you want to get recognition for reviewing this manuscript? Add a record of this review to Publons to track and showcase your reviewing expertise across the world’s journals. Signing up is quick, easy and free!
No