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Dear Editors,

Thank you for the quick review process and the sending of your requests regarding our paper “Reproducibility of different screening classifications in ultrasonography of the newborn’s hip”.

Response of the authors:

a) The approval was obtained by the local Board of Ethics, University Hospital Marburg

   Address:
   Philipps Universität Marburg
   Dekanat/ Ethikkommission
   Baldingerstr.
   35032 Marburg

b) According to your recommendation, we have copyedited the paper by International Science Editing

c) The authors declare that they have no competing interests
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Dear Reviewers,

Thank you for your thorough reading and reviewing of our paper. We have adjusted the manuscript according to your suggestions. The changes in the document are highlighted in yellow.

Reviewer 1:

- We have edited the manuscript by a professional copyediting service (International Science Editing)
- Limitations of our study (including impact of the sample size) were described in a separate paragraph at the end of the discussion (highlighted)
Table 1 is omitted in the revised version. The text is adjusted and we have attached a new figure for descriptive parameters.

Statistics in Table 3 and 4 (new tables 2 and 3): In table 3 the total agreement from all investigators was given in the last column. We now have renamed this column to clarify this. We did not include p-values in table 2 and 3, since in our opinion the aim of a reproducibility study is to quantify the difference between repeated measurements (see for example Grouven U, Bender R, Ziegler A, Lange S Comparing methods of measurement Dtsch Med Wochenschr. 2007;132).

The conclusions were adjusted.

Reviewer 2:

- We have edited the manuscript by a professional copyediting service (International Science Editing)
  For ultrasonography, ultrasound and sonography we used the consistent term US in the revised manuscript. All tables and figures are labelled.
- Table 1 was criticised by both reviewers. In place of this table we have attached a figure with the working definitions for the subjective (adjusted: descriptive) parameters. I personally discussed the term with Christian Tschauner (Stolzalpe, Austria; an expert in US of the pediatric hip; and a famous hip surgeon). He recommended using the term descriptive.
- The Methods/Results/Discussion part is modified by our statistician according to your suggestions.

We are looking forward to hearing from you.

Greetings from Marburg

Christian-Dominik Peterlein, MD
(Corresponding Author)