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Dear editor,

We have updated the contribution of the authors. All mentioned authors contributed substantially and, read and approved the final manuscript. The authors declare that they have no competing interests. No benefits or funds were received in support of this study.

Reviewer: Oeystein Skare

Reviewer's report:
The paper is improved satisfactory according to the concerns in previous reviews. I do not have any further comments or concerns.

Thank you for your time and effort for reading and commenting on our paper.

Reviewer: Ole Marius Ekeberg

Reviewer's report:
I think the paper is improving; most of the criticisms from last review have been adequately addressed. I will only suggest minor essential revisions:

Thank you for your time and effort for reading and commenting on our paper.

1. In the abstract, I think that standard error of measurement (SEM) should be mentioned under the method section (……(ICC) and SEM for test-retest reliability….).

We agree, we added the SEM and SDC to the method section of the abstract:
“Agreement was measured using the Standard Error of Measurement (\( SEM_{\text{agreement}} \)); and the smallest detectable change (SDC) was calculated based on the SEM.”

2. Subheading “Validation” on page 7 should be rephrased as this section contains more methodological aspects in general. My suggestion would be “Methods”.
   Because the main section is already called “methods” we decided to rephrase the this subsection to “visits”. The editor is free to change the subheading if he finds “visits” not appropriate.

3. On page 8. Under the statistics section, I think it would be appropriate to rephrase the 3. sentence to include the 11-point hindrance scale. “….quality of life questionnaire (RAND-36), a commonly used clinical shoulder score (constant score) and the 11-point shoulder hindrance scale.”
   We added this accordingly to your comment.

4. On page 8, under the “Agreement and reliability” section, I think the last part of the 7th sentence (…. “which estimates the reliability of the WORC” ) can be removed. Reliability is most often used as an umbrella-term and the last part of the sentence does not add anything to the content.
   Thank you for this remark, we removed this.

5. Under Results and validation on page 8, I think both absolute numbers and percentages should be presented.
   We changed this accordingly.

6. On page 9, under agreement and reliability, I think the result of the SEM and the SDC of the total score should be written clearly and not part of the range of the domain results ( ex. SEM and SDC for the Worc total score was 6.0 and 16.7, respectively. For the different domain…. ) SEM and SDC is maybe the most applicable results for clinical use.
   Thank you for pointing this out, we elaborated this.

7. On page 10, the middle section there is a sentence that needs to be rephrased as it has no meaning (Clinical differences revealed by…….).
   We rephrased this sentence.

8. Page 11, first section, the sentence “The larger the SEM the lower the reliability and precision of the instrument”, I believe “the reliability” can be erased from the sentence, with the same argument as under 4.
   We removed this.