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Reviewer’s report:

The major query to me is the use of the 'modified jacknife technique' to compare responsiveness measures (p7).

My first comment is that, although I know what is generally meant by jacknifing, I had no idea what was meant in this context, or how the method was 'modified'. Consequently I doubt that many of your readers will know this.

My second comment is that the authors do not state how this was carried out i.e. which package was used, or whether a program was written specially.

Consequently, it would be difficult to replicate the work.

The authors cited 2 references to support the use of this technique. Reference 7 describes a method which is based on regression, which is fairly complex, but which seems to have some validity. However, it is unclear to me how jacknifing is relevant to the regression (although I might be able to guess this).

I would suggest that the authors

1. state WHY they used this method rather than a simpler method to compare the responsiveness values
2. give a brief description of the method used and HOW it was applied (e.g. a package or a routine written).

Only then can we truly assess its validity.

The use of Bonferroni corrections, and the choice of summary statistics both seem fine.