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Reviewer’s report:

Dear editors
Dear authors
Thank you for your hard work aimed at improving the scientific quality of the manuscript.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?

Methods
Study design
Good changes. In my opinion the visibility of this section is much better than in the previous version of the manuscript.

Major Compulsory Revisions

Please add number of females and males included in the particular stages of the inter-tester reproducibility and inter-method agreement sections. In my opinion it is important to strictly repetition of the study.

Phase 3: In the third sentence there is an information that ‘…1 children with, and 20 children without…were sent to the allocated testers (figure 2).’ Please explain why in each of diagrams in Figure 2 there exist 20 participants.

In my last review I draw attention to the exclusion criteria. Did authors taken into account the children with hypermobility syndrome?

Methods

Minor Essential Revisions

1 sentence: I suggest to shift the citation at the end of the sentence or to remove the part after citation. In my opinion, if this sentence part is not from the reference [4] it is only the authors opinion without evidence.

Minor Essential Revisions
I have still problem with the validity of the assessment of range of motion based only on the visual judgment, but it worth noting that the discussion section is much better and the authors sufficiently discuss this problem. However, the authors focus only on knee, fifth finger and elbow. Therefore, I suggest to add a
similar information regarding visual judgment of the shoulder positions during evaluation of elbow hyperextension. Moreover please correct the word ‘hyperekstension’ in the Appendix 2.

Data analysis and statistics
I’m not a statistician, however, it seems that the statistical analysis was performed correctly.

3. Are the data sound?
Yes

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Good changes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported data?
Discussion is correctly supplemented.

Minor Essential Revisions
Paragraph 5, sentence 2: I suggest to shift the number of the citation at the end of the sentence.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
The authors did not include in the Discussion section a separate section for limitations. However, in my opinion the changes are sufficient.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Discretionary Revisions
Yes, but I still suggest to include in the Discussion section an information what is the difference between generalized joint hypermobility and hypermobility syndrome. The authors used in the Reference list the position which are focus on the hypermobility syndrome [3 and 20]. Therefore, I suggest to include a comment to distinguish GJH and HS.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Title
Minor Essential Revisions
The authors included the title with second sentence. I agree with this addition. However, in new version the title seems to be too long. Therefore, I suggest to put together these two sentences. E.g. Inter-tester reproducibility and inter-method agreement of two variants of performing of Beighton test for evaluation of Generalised Joint Hypermobility in primary school children.

Abstract
Good changes regarding explanations of Method A and B.
Minor Essential Revisions
Methods, sentence 2: I suggest to divide this sentence. The first part should be finish after word ‘respectively’. The second part should be start from '13 children…'.

Conclusions: please check the English expression of the second sentence.

8. Is the writing acceptable?

I`m not native English, therefore I’m not able to evaluate that. However please check the English expression (e.g. Conclusion in the Abstract and the first sentence in the 2nd Paragraph in the Conclusions sections in main manuscript).

Other comments

Background

Minor Essential Revisions

Paragraph 4: sentence 2, the references should be at the end of the sentence [4,11].

sentence 3: first part of this sentence should to have a reference

sentence 5: Please add the reference. If the authors don't have reference for this sentence, please be less declarative, as in this case the sentence is only the authors opinion.

Appendix 2: please divide the words ‘shoulderflexion’ and ‘shoulderabduction’. I have also problem with the word ‘volarflexed’. Please rephrase it.

Discretionary Revisions

Please to add the phrase `et al.` where the cited paper has more than two authors (e.g. Hansen et al. [7] and Smits-Engelsman et al. in the Discussion section).

Yours sincerely

Dariusz Czaprowski, PT, PhD
Department of Physiotherapy
Józef Rusiecki University College, Olsztyn, Poland

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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