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Dear Editor,

Thank you for your previous comments regarding our paper.

We are pleased to submit our point-by-point response to the changes requested on our paper, “The Italian version of the Physical Therapy Patient Satisfaction Questionnaire (PTPSQ-I(15). Psychometric properties in a sample of inpatients.” We hope that we have made all the changes requested prior to publication and our manuscript is now acceptable. In any case, we are waiting for your critique and/or further suggestions. Changes have been made in bold and blue in the text to facilitate your review.

We look forward to hearing your response and thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Paolo Pillastrini

EDITOR

1. More specific clarification on some points raised by the reviewers is needed. For example if there is not sufficient Italian literature on the effect of therapist gender on patient satisfaction then it is important to consider the international literature.

We clarified this point in the Discussion section, and included some new references to better explain the effect of therapist gender on patient satisfaction.

2. The Rule of thumb for sample size needs to be clarified in this context.

We included the following sentences: Rules-of-thumb vary from four to 10 subjects per variable, with a minimum number of 100 subjects to ensure stability of the variance-covariance matrix [6]. As a consequence, our final expected sample was 150 subjects.

3. The randomisation procedure is not fully explained in satisfactory terms - more detail is needed to demonstrate it was concealed and could be replicated.

In the Methods section we included the following sentence: After having obtained the informed consent and before the administration of the PTPSQ-I(15), research assistants opened a closed envelope containing the option “yes” or “no,” indicating whether to include or exclude the patient in the re-test subgroup.

4. The point of administration [ie which session] of the survey is not stated as requested by the reviewer.

We thank the Editor for this suggestion. We moved the sentence: “Questionnaires were administered before a session of physical therapy treatment, excluding the first session, and in separate rooms, ensuring privacy.” to another place in the text. We believe that this should be clearer to the readers.

5. The reference 3 is not appropriate and needs to be changed.

We changed reference 3.
6. Careful proof reading is needed - there are many incidences of missing words and incorrect phrasing.

Corrected in the text.