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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

Thank you for inviting us to revise and resubmit the manuscript: "Clinical comparative effectiveness of acupuncture versus manual therapy treatment of lateral epicondylitis: feasibility randomized clinical trial." (PAFS-D-18-00155).

We thank the Deputy Editor and both reviewers for their thorough evaluation and the thoughtful comments on the manuscript. Below is a point-by-point response to latest comments. We have responded to each comment made by the reviewers successively in this letter, each comment is cited and is followed by our response and actions.

We hope that you consider our manuscript much improved and suitable for publication in your journal.

Editor's comments:

Authors response:

Minor comments:

1) Please report mean differences between groups (95% CI) rather than within groups for table 2.

2) For table 3, please report Mean differences between groups along with the corresponding 95% CI for each comparison. And consider deleting the p-values.
3) For the CONSORT extension to pilot and feasibility trials checklist, please indicate the page on which each item is reported.

Thank you for the positive evaluation of our paper.

Thank you for pointing this out….

1) The mean differences between groups are important and clinically relevant however they are already listed in the edited version of Table 3. Moreover, table 2 lists all the estimated mean values for all the 3 groups at all the measurement point; if we were to compute all the possible between differences the table would be very large and difficult to read. In addition, the aim of this study was to evaluate the whole treatment period, not differences at selected time points. We consider it more relevant also for the patients – their experience during the whole study period, not only at given time points. Therefore, and also in light of changes made to table 3, we would like to keep Table 2 in its current version. However, if the reviewer still thinks we should list all the possible pairwise difference we will provide them (page 16, paragraph 1).

2) We have made all the requested changes to Table 3. We completely agree with the reviewer that point estimates with 95% CI are more informative than p-values and therefore the p-values are not deleted (page 17, paragraph 1).

3) We have made all the requested changes to the CONSORT extension to pilot and feasibility trials checklist. We have indicated the pages on which each item is reported.

Sincerely,

Katrine Bostrøm

Corresponding author