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Reviewer’s report:

The manuscript has been updated according to the comments from the first review report, below are new comments to the manuscript.

Major Compulsory Revisions (MCR)

MCR 1: I think that the study would benefit from a larger sample size, since this seems to be the major issue. However, I am aware that this may not be possible. Therefore it must be stated even more clearly as a limitation (in both abstract and discussion) with regard to the applicability both clinical and in research context.

MCR 2: The between-session comparison of your study reveals that the difference between session 2 and session 3 is almost significant. You need to comment on this.

MCR 3: Page 14, line 282-283. In what way were they representative? Age, gender, WOMAC etc.?

MCR 4: Since the focus of the study as stated both in the title and the purpose is also on test-retest reliability, one would assume that you would also comment on this in the discussion and conclusion. However after your revision of the manuscript, you are not mentioning it in the conclusions, except for your comment on practice trials and standardized protocols. Why? Is it because of the change in statistics? If so perhaps the sections on test-retest reliability should be changed to.

Minor Essential Revisions (MER)

MER 1: Page 4, line 83. The reason why reliability of the 20-meter walk test in mild to moderate OA is interesting (in addition to the results on end-stage OA published by Villadsen et al.) is still not clear. Perhaps a dependent clause after “…using a symptomatic population with mild to moderate OA.” would help. It could be something like “; a population often applied in clinical trials on OA”.

MER 2: Page 2, line 47. You state that the participants were elected. In the methods you state that they are consecutive. If they are consecutive, please state that in the abstract as well.
MER 3: Page 10, line 212-213. You state: “…walking times in session 1 were slower in
the first session than the second…”. Perhaps you mean: “…walking times were
slower in
the first session than the second…”?

MER 4: Page 15, line 300-301. Your final comment of the discussion seems a bit
isolated from the paragraph above. Please make their connection more obvious.

MER 5: In Table 1, you use both “[sd]” and “(sd)” please revise.
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