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Reviewer's report:

Positive criticism

Most of my comments have been well addressed and corrected in the revised paper, especially items 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12 of my comments to the first version.

Negative criticism

Minor essential revisions

1. Item 1. Comparison of SRM of SPADI versus ROM.
This has been discussed in the 3rd paragraph of the discussion (p. 14). I suggest clarify this issue by adding (2nd last sentence of that paragraph): “When comparing … but we are not comparing the same change i.e. the change in scales which do not measure the same construct.”

2. Item 5. Comparison to previous literature.
This issue has began to discuss in the 4th paragraph of the discussion (end of p. 14) which ends by “Comparisons across studies are difficult”. This is too simple. We are able, for example, to compare the results of ref. 10 (Table 1) to those of the present study: the cASES motion active (SRM 1.54) has exactly the same construct as C.AROM (SRM 1.28) of the present study (see p. 7). The same is true for the CASES motion passive (SRM 1.47) and C.PROM (SRM 1.52). These results can now be compared to the SRMs of the SPADI function (SRMs 1.51 (ref 10) and 1.76) and SPADI total score (SRMs 1.72 (ref 10) and 1.81) within each study. I suggest to add this more sophisticated comparison of the present to previous results.

3. Item 6. Correlations SPADI to ROM.
This has been corrected since the correlations are low. In addition, the linear regression between the SPADI total score and the C.AROM (Table 4) is a very informative completion to the correlation results. Please add the p-values of the coefficients to Table 4 to assess the significance of the prediction/correlation.

1. The updated reference for these guidelines (instead of ref 28, Guillemin 1993) is: Beaton DE, Bombardier C, Guillemin F, Bosi Ferraz M. Guidelines for the

2. Of the translation process, the stage VI, “Submission of the documentation of the stages I to V to the developers of the original questionnaire or the AAOS to ensure that the process was correctly carried out and a reasonable translation was achieved.” has not been performed. This has been stated in the comments but not in the paper. This has to be explained (why not been performed) and stated as limitation in the discussion of the paper.
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