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Reviewer’s report:

It appears that the replies from the authors were dictated but not proof read! Many English usages seemed strange. In addition while the authors claimed to made all the suggested revisions, there were still issues that were not properly handled in the revised text. For example, the authors claim to have used the SPIRIT guidelines in their revision; yet do not reference them in the list of References. Here are some suggested revisions.

1. P(age) 3, l(ine) 7. Include the date of registration and the date the first patient was randomized. This was Item 4 in the previous review.
2. P 5, I 23. Insert [(SD)] after [mean].
3. P 10, I 3. Delete [and/]. This was Item 10 in the previous review.
4. P 11, I 1. Rewrite as [to the intervention are the only factors ...].
5. P 11, I 3. Replace [population] by [patients]. This is NOT a population.
6. P 12, I 4. Replace [is performed] by [are measured].
8. P 12, I 20. Rewrite as [interfere considerably].
9. P 13, I 9. Who is the PI, the first author? If so, state it.
11. P 13, I 24, Replace [yielded] by [obtained].
15. P 17, I 3. State the year. Is it 2010?
16. P 23, I 2. Rewrite as [... study, drafted the statistical analysis plan and ...]. The study is not over so the analysis is premature.