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**Reviewer's report:**

This is a very interesting paper describing a well designed study on advanced physiotherapy roles. The authors are to be congratulated with this study. I only have a few comments.

Major compulsory revisions.

1. Abstract: Please indicate the direction of the differences between surgeons and physiotherapists regarding type of treatment recommendations and imaging tests ordered.

2. Replacing orthopedic surgeons by physiotherapist has lots to do with reducing healthcare costs. This economic reason hasn't been mentioned explicitly in the introduction paragraph.

3. Page 6: Please provide an explicit statement that the surgeon and the physiotherapist were ignorant regarding the outcome of their assessments and decisions.

4. The two healthcare providers used 6 diagnostic categories of the knee and 5 of the hip. It seems that the level of agreement was high. Were these diagnostic assessment based on a fixed protocol and which tests were used? Please clarify?

5. Page 7: 'In the event where the APP and the orthopaedic surgeon disagreed on the primary diagnosis, the secondary diagnoses was taken into account to further evaluate diagnostic concordance'. I do not understand the rationale behind this approach. It seems to me that this may inflate the results of this study.

6. Page 8: These 312 patients, was this the entire group on the waiting list of the surgeons?
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