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**Reviewer’s report:**

The subject is highly relevant to the clinical field, however the methodological choices were so wrong by the opinion of all three reviewers that it is very hard to accept. Serious bias was indicated by all three reviewers: 1. The use of unreliable method to measure tenderness- although you now state it in your limitations it does not change the fact all the rest is based upon this faulty measurement. 2. The side to side comparison should have been symptomatic side to non symptomatic side. 3. The gender ANOVA is so weak, that i think it cannot be related. I suggest consulting a statistician re size effect in this matter to decide whether it should be removed.

I am sorry, i could not accept unless i see the tenderness measurement is somehow validated, and the gender issue evaluated/ removed.
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**Quality of written English:** Acceptable
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