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Reviewer's report:

This is a clearly written paper with relevant results for both clinical practice and research purposes.

Comments:

Abstract
For reliability the authors used ICC. Please provide this information in the methods of the abstract.

Introduction:
What was the rationale for choosing the 20 meter walking test? From a practical perspective it would be more appropriate to choose a 10-meter walking test since less space and time is required. Are there studies that recommend 20 m walk test over 10 m walk test?

Methods:
Were other sources of variation/error accounted for? E.g. was the time of the day kept equal between day 1 and day 2?
Statistical analyses: it would be more clear if the terms reliability and sensitivity (and how they are defined and determined) are headings within the statistical analyses. Please keep consequent terms with regard to agreement and sensitivity.

Results:
Bland-Altman plots: how did the authors judge the plots? Is there a cut-off point for lack of agreement?
ICC should be given with Confidence Intervals.
Figure 3: please provide units

Discussion:
Please also discuss the sensitivity in relation to the Minimal Important Difference (MID).
In the conclusion the authors state that one rater is recommended however in the present study they did not investigate inter-rater reliability. Therefore this
statement is hypothetical and not empirical.
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