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Reviewer's report:

This was an interesting study dealing with important feasibility issues prior to large scale effectiveness studies. Some minor comments for revision are detailed below:

Abstract

1. Pg 2 line 17: 'attending' not 'attended'

2. Pg 2 line 30-31: 'and at high risk' not 'and in high risk'

Introduction

3. Page 4 lines 10-23 (study objectives): Objectives 3 and 8, please change phrasing to increase clarification of the objective being tested. How was the use of questionnaires tested (validity, reliability, response rate, outcome etc)? How was the usefulness of the outcome measures established? Possibly an objective around modifications to the GLAD back program based on the results could also be added, as this is a major subheading in the results.

Methods

4. Page 5 line 39: 'December 31st' not 'December 31th'

5. Page 5 line 51-57: repeat of lines 46-51

6. Page 6 line 49: 'ion a treatment option' repeat of prior wording
7. Page 6 Interventions in the before- and after-group: was the before group specifically excluded from being involved in GLAD back? If they were being followed for 2 months, they might have still been receiving treatment when GLAD back started, and may have been included by the clinician. If excluded please state.

8. Page 9 line 13: there is a question mark that I don't think is intended

9. Was any data collected on the number of LBP patients seen by the practitioners during the recruitment period, to work out what percentage of patients were recruited to either the study or to the GLAD back program?

Discussion

10. Were the changes in PABS statistically significant? The analysis doesn't seem to be assessing for this but the statement in the discussion (page 14 lines 30-31) implies that there was a definite change. Please make the uncertainty more apparent if not a statistically significant result.

Figures

11. Figure 1: for the GLAD back group were there 2 specific inclusion timepoints as indicated or was inclusion available from August to December in total as it reads in the text?
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