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Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting study protocol for conducting a randomized controlled study. As it is the manuscript needs a major scientific revision and English editing.

The authors were focusing on the postural stability as the main hypothesis. They need to expand on the details of the postural stability measures. They should choose the main outcome variables related to postural stability and hypothesis based on postural stability. Sample size calculations should also be based on the postural stability. Looks like they have calculated sample size based on VAS pain.

Manual therapy is applied high velocity spinal manipulation at T4, cervical articular mobilization, suboccipital inhibition. The authors should clearly provide rationale for this choice of treatment? This is a combined therapy.

Exercise treatment consists of graded exercise over three weeks.

Sham treatment will consist of contact by physiotherapist. How can the patients believe it to be a treatment. Need to provide details? Are they assessing the believability of the sham treatment. Do they sign a consent form that they may be assigned to a sham treatment.

I do not have the statistical expertise and should be carefully reviewed by a bio-statistician experienced in clinical trials.

Study is designed based on the hypothesis of postural stability. Are they going to evaluate the associations of clinical improvements with the changes in the postural stability?

Level of interest
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An article of importance in its field
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