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**Reviewer's report:**

The paper relates to a study which was formerly described in two separate papers. As a result, the authors refer the reader to the previous paper regarding the study population and intervention. This is quite unusual; a study should be integral and self sufficient. If the reader has to go back, much of the natural flow and smoothness is lost.

Consequently (and furthermore), in the Method section the authors give an elaborate, and sometimes slightly difficult to follow, description of the statistical methods used to analyze the data. If the paper is to follow the regular format then this description is misplaced: either insert it in the Introduction or elaborate on the implications in the Discussion. In the event, the Method becomes an extension of the Introduction or a preamble to the Discussion.

In terms of the responsiveness and a rather detailed exposure of the ‘internal responsiveness’ one is surprised to find that the so-called ‘external responsiveness’ is in fact Pearson’s r. While that may be OK in semantic or taxonomic terms, it appears much like an anti-climax, bringing back the issue of responsiveness to ground zero, so to speak.

Ultimately, it turns out that its efficiency notwithstanding the SPADI is distinguished by a responsiveness which is mere 10% (85% vs. 75%) higher than that of the combined AROM. Which begs the question whether, given the general nature of RoM measurements vs. the specificity of SPADI, RoM may not be sufficient.

Otherwise this is a very well written paper, precise in its definitions and comprehensive in all other respects which I would have
preferred to see as an annex to the previous papers (given its unusual structure) than an independent paper.