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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:

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…..).

2. Subheading “Validation” on page 7 should be rephrased as this section contains more methodological aspects in general. My suggestion would be “Methods”.

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.”

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.

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

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.

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……).

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.
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