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Reviewer's report:

General
I would like to congratulate the authors on their bold revision of the data presentation. I understand that it has been difficult to know how best to present the results and am satisfied with the position we have now reached. The paper is now considerably improved and although agreement is a little weaker I don't feel this matters, now that the data is clearer. 50% agreement is still an impressive achievement in this patient population and no doubt future work will improve things further.

I am happy to recommend this paper for publication.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Table 2, please add labels to identify which totals apply to the reference standard and physiotherapist.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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