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Author’s response to reviews:

Responses to Reviewer

Dear Editors:

Thank you for sending me the comments on our paper ‘Cerebral mechanism of celecoxib for treating knee pain: study protocol for a randomized controlled parallel trial (TRLS-D-18-00469)’. I appreciate the review and have made a revision accordingly (revisions were shown in
red). On behalf of my co-authors, I am submitting the revised paper for possible publication in Trials.

Should there be any questions regarding this submission, please do not hesitate to contact me. My contact information is as follows: LZJ_2019@sina.com

Reviewer #1: The article is well written in general, and the language is of an acceptable standard.

1. Please provide reference for your "previous studies" (Page Lines 34 to 38)

Response: Thank you for pointing this out. We have added the reference in our manuscript. The reference is [QIU K, JING M, SUN R, et al. The Status of the Quality Control in Acupuncture-Neuroimaging Studies[J]. Evidence-Based Complementary and Alternative Medicine, 2016, 2016(4): 13685785.]

2. Please state actual power, the current description only refers to "powerful statistical power"(Page Lines 34 to 38)

Response: Thanks for the suggestion. There are maybe some confusions in our expressions, for which we want to clarify. The sample size calculation of neuroimaging study is different from that of classic randomized controlled trials (RCTs). General speaking, in fMRI studies, 12 to 15 patients per group provide a stable statistical result. The "powerful statistical power" should be "a stable statistical result". We have rewritten this paragraph.

3. The section on "MRI data acquisition section need to be written in future tense, it is currently in past tense.

Response: Thanks for the suggestion. This section has been rewritten in future tense.

4. The third paragraph of the "Data Analysis" section need to be rewritten for clarity. The acronym "rs-fMRI" needs to be defined. Would this paragraph sit better in the introduction section?

Response: Thank you for the suggestion. The third paragraph of the "Data Analysis" section has been rewritten. The "rs-fMRI" has been defined in this section. However, after a careful and intensive discussion with my co-authors, we've decided not to sit this paragraph in the introduction section. The reasons lie in two aspects: 1) In this section, we mainly talk about the clinical and fMRI data analysis. If we put this paragraph in the introduction, we worry that readers can not catch the key point of this article. 2) General speaking, in MRI protocols, MRI data often was written in the "Data Analysis" section.
Additionally, we modified one author’s (Zhengjie Li) e-mail address as below: E-mail: lzjbenjamin@163.com. We hope that it’s not too late for this modification to the manuscript.

We look forward to a positive reply. Thank you very much again.