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Reviewer’s report:

Clinical studies like these are important to further the evidence base for clinical tests our profession use.

Overall the whole paper needs to be checked for English. There are a number of areas where it is incorrect. I feel all of my revisions are major.

Some specific comments that need to be addressed.

Intro- There is a need for a better explanation of the difference between pain provoking tests and MCI- there seems to be some contradiction between the intro, method and discussion re this, or perhaps it is not explained well enough.

Methods- Correct or incorrect- two options. Did they have to have all correct elements of the test to be correct? Or only one element of an incorrect to be incorrect.

Free movement- how was this defined and how was this tested for inclusion criteria?

Some of the exclusions mentioned in the discussion are not well spelt out in the methods. This needs to be added to exclusion criteria. Also more detail rather than just referring to the reference here would be helpful to the reader.

Tables- Need to be stand alone and thus need more explanation. Abbreviations need to be referred to.

Also there are no SD values in Table 1.

Table 1 should be in the results section.

NDI/50 or 100

Figure 5 is probably redundant.

Results- It would be good to give the breakdown of normals versus neck pain and how these were scored. Although I realise that this wasn’t the main aim of the study, it would still be helpful to see if this type of testing has some potential for discriminative power.

It may also be helpful to merge Table 2 and each of the figures or at least repeat the instruction for the test in the figure caption.
Discussion- need to add a little more as to the "so what" factor when mentioning different elements rather than stating the fact.

References appear to be incorrect- several that are in the bibliography are not cited/ missing in the text.

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.
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