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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editor:

Attached is the revised manuscript entitled "Reliability of Measures of Impairments Associated With Patellofemoral Pain Syndrome". We have made the changes and corrections suggested by both reviewers and provide a point-by-point response. We have also incorporated the proposed formatting changes.

This revised manuscript has been read and agreed by all authors.

Thank you for your consideration. I look forward to receiving your reply.

Sincerely,

Sara Piva, PT, PhD, OCS, FAAOMPT
Assistant Professor
Department of Physical Therapy
University of Pittsburgh
6035 Forbes Tower
Pittsburgh, PA 15260 (USA)
Phone: (412) 383 -6712
Fax: (412) 383-6629

Point-by point response:

Reviewer Michael Callaghan
Major compulsory revisions:
1- We have described the method of scoring the tight lateral retinacular structures (lines 15 and 16, page 9).
2- We have explained why a non functional position was chosen for Q-angle (lines 5 - 8, page 19).
3- We have provided evidence that the data were normally distributed (lines 14 and 15 of page 14, and lines 13 and 14 of page 15).

Minor essential revisions:
1- We have replaced PFP with PFPS throughout the text.
2- Typographical errors were corrected.

Discretionary revisions:
1- Suggestion was well taken. We replaced "measurement properties" with "reliability".

Reviewer Nadine Foster
Major compulsory revisions:
1- We have added a whole paragraph (3rd paragraph of discussion) where we discuss the reasons we have chosen to focus our investigation on inter-tester reliability, rather than intra-tester reliability.

2- We have provided information about the adequacy of the sample size for the continuous variables (lines 9 - 11, page 15).

3- a) We have added a new table (Table 4). In Table 4 we present the reliability coefficients for the overall sample and for each of the 2 pairs of testers. We have also added description of the Table in the results section and a new paragraph discussing the findings in the discussion section (last paragraph of page 21); b) We have clarified that the means and standard deviations reported in Table 3 are the means of all 4 testers. We added such information in the description of Table 3 in the results section as well as in the title of Table 3. We left the information about the means and standard deviations in Table 3 because we believe it gives the reader a clear idea of the range of measures in our sample; c) We have added an extensive discussion about how to use the SEM to calculate a confidence interval around the obtained score (lines 12 to 22 in page 22).

4- We have added a paragraph discussing how the age range of our study may have influenced the ICC results (3rd paragraph of page 21).

5- We have added a paragraph in the discussion where we discuss the potential limitations of our finding regarding clinical practice (last paragraph page 23).

Minor essential revisions:

1- We have reworded the introduction according with the suggestions. In addition, we did add a paragraph in the discussion clarifying why we did not determine intra-tester reliability (3rd paragraph of discussion). We did not add the definition of intra and inter-tester reliability in the introduction because we believe the readers of BMC Musculoskeletal are well versed in such definitions.

2- Reference #12 was not right. We made the correction.

3- Suggestion well taken (lines 5 and 6 of procedures subsection).

4- a) We clarified in the exclusion criteria for some of the criteria. We now state that the patients have to have "known or suspected conditions"; b) We have added a paragraph discussing how the age range of our study may have influenced the ICC results (3rd paragraph of page 21); c) We have broken down the age in decade banding in Table 1.

5- We added the suggested footnotes in Table 1.

6- In light that we have mention the key findings of Table 3 in the first paragraph of the discussion section, which is right next to the results section, we decided not to repeat this info in the results section.

7- Typo was corrected.

8- We acknowledged the limitation of comparing ICC and Pearson correlation coefficients (4th paragraph of discussion).

9- Discussion about the use of SEM was added in page 22.