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Reviewer’s report:

I think that this paper is stronger for the changes that have been made but there a few minor issues that remain:

1) Table 1 - as you have taken out the p-values as suggested, the footnote about statistical tests is now redundant (page 6, line 23-24)

2) The only p value you have now included is for comparison of QoL scores (page 11, line 4). If, as the previous reviewer suggested, it is not appropriate to discuss statistical significance for limb volumes in light of the small sample size then presumably it is not relevant for the QoL results either? If this is the case the section on 'statistical analysis' (page 8, line 11) also needs amending.

3) I still think table 3 is unclear. Is it showing the mean differences between R leg and L leg over time such that over the first 3m, the difference between the affected and unaffected limbs increased by 300 in the control group and 78 in the intervention group i.e the lymphoedema worsened in both groups but more so in the control group? If so, it would be clearer to show the mean absolute differences for each group at baseline, 3m and 6m timepoints and the change.

4) In a related point linked to the clarity of table 3, in your results section you state "The largest changes were seen at 3-6 months; for the control group the mean difference in volume was +128 mls, 95% CI [-303, +560] and for the intervention group, +311 mls, 95% CI [-226, +848] (Table 3)". I'm not clear in what way this was the largest change as from the figures given, these are neither the largest numbers nor the greatest differences.

5) Page 13, line 9 - there is a 's' missing off the end of week.
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