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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Mr Fitzpatrick,

Thank you for the comments, underneath are our answers and the revised manuscript is uploaded.

1. Include discussion of this study based on point 2 from your response-2-Editor letter which should detail the different aims of the two studies and limitations with not having a complete study design.

Discussion was included (page 23).

2. Indicate why BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders was chosen a journal source as peer-review at BMJ Open had already been completed and given that the BMJ Open peer-review reports were not so critical. Did you withdraw your study protocol, or was it rejected?
The first peer-review that the study protocol has undergone was by the Belgian Government before we got the FWO funding. Based on the comments we provided you from the BMJ Open (2nd peer-review), the study protocol was rejected. We adapted our protocol and wanted to publish it in BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders because it is also an Open access journal that publishes study protocols.

High regards, on behalf of the co-authors,

Christiaan Heusdens