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Reviewer's report:

General
The manuscript improved after revision and the authors have respond to our comments. I have still some problems with the potential "physiotherapist effect":
- how the authors respond to the potential biais introduced by the fact that the outcomes were extracted by those who were responsible for the intervention?
- how the authors took into account the cluster effect? I understand that due to the limited number of physiotherapists et the limited number of patients per physiotherapist it was not possible to analyse the effect of the practioners's characteristics. But it was certainly possible to use a model which took into account this cluster effect.

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)

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

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

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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