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Reviewer's report:

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS:

1. The statement of purpose sentence beginning “The purpose of this investigation” is not clearly stated. After the “and” is the portion of the sentence that is not clear. Possibly stating “to add information on functional performance and self-reported function” would be clearer. The title of the study and the purpose don’t seem to agree.

2. In the “Methods” section, there was no indication of the speed at which the internal and external rotation strength was measured. This should be stated for comparison purposes. It was stated that the testing was conduction per Leroux et al. That group tested at two different speeds.

3. The heading “Analysis” should be “Analyses”.

4. The “Results” section is poorly written. The section jumps from topic to topic too frequently making it confusing for the reader. Better organization of the tables and the presentation of data would make the section easier to follow. One example would be that table 5 should be table 4 based on the order that the information is presented in the text.

5. It is also very confusing when the data presented in the text is not clearly stated as data examined by sex or if the information is referring to the data examined with men and women combined. This should be stated more clearly. In one section it is stated but at the end of the presentation of the data and would be more clear if it was stated at the beginning of the presentation of data. (i.e. Page 11 beginning with “The dominant side was significantly” and ending with “Gender and dominance had”)

6. Many variables that were stated as significantly different in the text were not indicated as different on the tables. An example is the difference in strength between men and women. The text states that the men were significantly stronger than the women in all age categories. This is not shown on the table. There are many examples of this in the results section.

7. For Table 1 and 2, the differences appear to exist only with the data combined. Were there any differences in the data by sex? Again, the text states on page 12 that “women had significantly more range of motion than men for seated external
rotation…..”

8. For Table 3, again the text states differences between men and women but the table only appears to show differences between the age categories for men.

9. The text on page 12 discussing the FIT-HaNSA data suggests significant differences between the tasks while the table indicates no differences.

10. The text on page 12, the last paragraph refers to table 4 for SST scores while table 4 only shows the data for the FIT-HaNSA test.

11. Spelling (line is counted as lines of text):

Page 9 line 10 giving should be given
Page 10 line 2 score should be scores
Page 10 line 8 score should be scores
Page 11 line 7 rotations should be rotation
Page 12 line 19 decrease should be decreased
Page 13 line 7 reflect should be reflects
Page 13 line 18 suggests should be suggest
Page 14 line 9 others should be other
Page 14 line 9 motions should be motion
Page 15 line 20 measures should be measured
Page 17 line 23 level should be levels

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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