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Reviewer's report:

The authors report on an interesting proof-of-concept study of osteopathic manipulation in patients with obstructive sleep apnoea syndrome. Before I can recommend the manuscript for publication, I suggest some minor revisions:

1. Abstract: I would suggest not to mention the postulated mechanisms of neuromodulation in the abstract, as it was not within the scope of the study to prof this mechanism for the used osteopathic technique. It is further on not necessary to mention the used randomization software in the abstract. Besides, authors should state what kind of numbers they presented in brackets in the results of the abstract. This is a little unclear. In the conclusion, the authors should writ "may improve", as this was no efficacy trial.

2. Background: This section should be shortened.

3. Methods: In the first sentence of the study design, "osteopathic" should be added.

4. Randomization: It remains unclear who performed the random sequence generation and how allocation concealment was secured.

5. Results: Table1: The table needs some further explanation of the pictured numbers.

6. Discussion: It remains unclear, how the authors examined successful blinding as they described in line 26 of page 13. Did they ask the patients using a questionnaire? If not, the authors should discuss in more detail why they did not so and how study effects might be influenced due to possible de-blinding (higher pain perception in the experimental group).
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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