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TRLS-D-18-01016R1

Targeted Interventions to Prevent Chronic Low Back Pain in High Risk Patients: Development and Delivery of a Pragmatic Training Course of Psychologically Informed Physical Therapy for the TARGET Trial

Jason Beneciuk, DPT, PhD, MPH; Steven Z. George, PT, PhD; Carol Greco, PhD; Michael Schneider, DC, PhD; Stephen T. Wegener, PhD; Robert Saper, MD, MPH; Anthony Delitto, PT, PhD

Thank you to the Associate Editor and Reviewers for comments and suggestions provided. Responses to reviewer comments are provided in boldface font below. All changes within text of revised manuscript are highlighted and indicated using boldface font.
Associate Editor Comments:

Your manuscript "Targeted Interventions to Prevent Chronic Low Back Pain in High Risk Patients: Development and Delivery of a Pragmatic Training Course of Psychologically Informed Physical Therapy for the TARGET Trial" (TRLS-D-18-01016R1) has been assessed by our reviewers. Based on these reports, and my own assessment as Editor, I am pleased to inform you that it is potentially acceptable for publication in Trials, once you have carried out some essential revisions suggested by our reviewers. Please address one point made by reviewer 1 (detail that this is a quality improvement evaluation; point 9) and the minor point by reviewer 3.

Thank you again to the Associate Editor for expressing interest in our manuscript and allowing us the opportunity to provide another revised version. As requested, we have addressed point 9 made by Reviewer 1 (regarding quality improvement evaluation) and minor point by Reviewer 3.

Reviewer Reports:

Reviewer #1:

Thank you the authors for addressing the comments. Most comments were adequately addressed and manuscript appropriately revised. I have some further recommendations about point 4 and 9.

Thank you again to Reviewer 1 for providing positive comments.

1. Point 4 – related to Methods:

• Reviewer #1 previous comment: Lacks important details (study design, total sample size, selection and recruitment of the participants, details on data type and normal distribution testing). It would be also useful to adopt more standard way of reporting of quantitative research.

• Author previous response: 'Just to clarify, the current manuscript is a companion paper for the more traditional protocol paper that will provide full description of details listed above. The TARGET Trial protocol paper is currently in peer-review process and has not yet been published; therefore depending on timeline we may be able to reference protocol paper when formally accepted?'
• Reviewer #1 new comment: my view would be there are only way to resolve it; one would be to wait till the companion paper is published (or at least accepted) to be appropriately referenced or two - this manuscript needs to state the details it is currently missing.

We understand Reviewer #1 concerns about this issue, however information about the TARGET Trial being prospectively registered with ClinicalTrials.gov has been provided. We believe (along with Reviewer #3) that these details provide sufficient context for the reader. We added a sentence in manuscript indicating additional trial details can be found at ClinicalTrials.gov registry site.

2. Point 9 – related to live workshop:

• Reviewer #1 previous comment: Within the PIPT website it states the 1 day live workshop is highly recommended. Was it monitored how many attended and was there a difference between those who did and did not in measured outcomes?

• Author previous response: 'To clarify, the PIPT website states: "It is highly recommended that all of the online modules be viewed prior to attending the live workshop." All sites participating in the TARGET Trial were required to host a live workshop. However, we were not able to monitor specific aspects of participation due to evaluation being quality improvement based. We were also not able to measure PABS-PT or confidence outcomes for physical therapists that did not attend the workshop because the videos were never meant to be "stand alone" for training physical therapists.'

• Reviewer #1 new comment: On that basis this being quality improvement evaluation needs to be acknowledged in the manuscript

We have acknowledged the strategies and measures used were for quality improvement evaluation in two major subheadings (pages 10 and 13) and within text (page 11).

Good luck with the trial

Thank you to Reviewer #1
Reviewer #3:

This is a revision of an original submission to Trials in which the authors have provided a thoughtful and extensive response. They refer to a registered clinical trial of which the protocol is currently under review for publication. This provides sufficient context for the reader. The authors appropriately discuss the limitations of the study in this pragmatic trial. A minor point is grammatical.

P13, line 20. It is not possible to perform descriptive statistics on physiotherapists. Suggest delete this first sentence in the Evaluation of training section.

Thank you Reviewer 3 for the positive comments. We have removed this sentence as suggested.