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**Reviewer’s report:**

The manuscript has improved markedly after the revisions.

Some of the comments regarding the terminology are fair but not valid, as dictionnaires are far less scientific than discussion panels.

I am worried to the fact that the authors refused to send the data as requested by the editor, although I disagree with this, I respect their choice.

The high ICC values can only be explained by the reduced time interval as well as the lack of blinding from previous measurements (as well as it seems that the examiners knew before hand which patient was normal and which one has LBP), I think that authors should acknowledge this in the discussion section.

I am quite surprised that the results from normals are extremely close to the LBP patients, most of the current research on this shows exactly the opposite. Recent data from Professor Paul Hodges shows that the variability of motor control tasks are extremely variable and it is hard to find a common pattern of movements... in addition he found that day to day variability of performance in clinical tests are highly expected, even for very "precise" instruments as EMG and US measures.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests