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Version:2 Date: 22 March 2014

Reviewer: Silvana De Giorgi

Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors, I reviewed your article “Inter- and intraobserver reliability assessment of the axial trunk rotation: manual versus smartphone-aided measurement tools” and I declare that I have no competing interests.

This is an interesting article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests, but it needs Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached).

These are my comments:

1. The question is well defined by the authors.

2. The methods are appropriate but the results are confused.

The contradiction between results and conclusion was corrected.

3. The data description in the results section is confusing compared to the tables and to the last sentence of the Discussion Section

The contradiction between results and conclusion was corrected.

4. The reported data are not clearly explained.
Corrections have been made.

5. The discussion and conclusions are not well balanced and adequately supported by the data.

Corrections have been made.

6. Weaknesses and strengths of the study are not explained.

Weaknesses and strengths of the study were added in discussion.

7. I would suggest to improve the references by adding the Perdriolle method in the evaluation of the ATR, which is more accurate than the Cobb Angle in measuring the Axial Trunk Rotation.

The references were added as Ref. 16 and 17.

8. The Results are in contrast with the last sentence of the Discussion Section.

The contradiction between results and conclusion was corrected.

9. The writing is acceptable but has to be improved for a better comprehension of some statements.

Some statements have been modified.

Quality of written English: quite acceptable

Statistical review: I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.

I would suggest to improve references adding more articles about scoliosis and Perdriolle method to measure the vertebral rotation. As a matter of fact, you should have measured also the Perdriolle Angle of the vertebra at the
apex of the curve, which is more related to the Axial Trunk Rotation than the Cobb Angle.

The references were added as Ref. 16 and 17.

A photo of the position of the smartphone on the back of the patient could be very helpful in understanding the good use of the tool.

The photo has been added.

Section Discussion. Line 14: ........................................A reliability analysis have been performed to evaluate the consistency and measurement error of this smartphone-aided Cobb angle measurement method and compare its reliable characteristics with those of the manual method. The study proved that this state of art technique showed excellent reliability and efficiency 12. Please rewrite the last sentence to explain better.

The sentence has been rewritten.

At the end of the Discussion Section you state that “the intra-and interrater reliability was better in the group with large Cobb angle for both scoliometer and scoliogauge”, while in the abstract you state in the conclusion that “The intraobserver and interobserver reliability was better in mild curve (< 20 degrees) group” and also in the last sentence of the Results Section you state that “the intraobserver and interobserver reliability was better in mild curve (< 20 degrees) group”. This is very confusing! What do you mean by Large Cobb Angle Curve? Do you mean a Cobb Angle >40 degrees?

This is a slip of the pen. The sentence has been corrected.
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests.
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Reviewer's report:

The aim of this study was to assess the reliability of smartphone-aided measurement of scoliosis as compared with the manual method using a scoliometer. The results are interesting and supported by an appropriate statistical analysis. The paper is well written, and I have only some minor suggestions for improvement, as detailed below:

Abstract, Methods, line 3: "had" instead of "with"; Methods, 1st paragraph, 2nd line: "X-ray" could be omitted;

Methods, last paragraph, beginning of new page, 2nd line: "held" instead of "hold" and last line: "the" should be omitted;

Results, 2d paragraph, 5th line: insert a space between "angles" and "<";

Discussion, new page, 1st line: the sentence beginning with "A reliability analysis..." should be improved in style.

All the suggested modifications have been conducted.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

**Declaration of competing interests:** I declare that I have no competing interests.