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Major revisions:
Thank you so much to taking the time to address the comments previously provided. I think you did an exceptional job addressing the 1st major revision in the background section as well as most of the other suggested revisions. I believe there is still one major revision that needs to be addressed and that is with regards to the study conclusions. The validity of these tests, alone or in combination has not been addressed. Validity must be established before these can used as a clinical tool. It would be beneficial to address the validity of the tests in the conclusion section when you discuss further studies.

Minor Essential Revisions:

Methods
1. First paragraph page 7: Regarding Test 2: The information from McClure etal 2006 (and other scapular motion studies) needs to be better incorporated into that paragraph

Discretionary Revions

Background
1. First line page 6: remove “A” and start sentence with “Decreased scapular….

Procedure
1. Fourth sentence: …assessed in the seated position; IR, ER were assessed in 90 degrees of glenohumeral abduction
2. Sixth sentence: …assessed in the seated position
3. Second to last sentence on page 8: specializing
4. Last sentence on page 8: spell out NSA followed by the abbreviation in parentheses

I look forward to seeing the final copy!
**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.