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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for this well-written and elegant study.

I have the following questions / suggestions:

1) Perhaps I missed it, but it is unclear to me whether the PTs and OTs completed both the PET-MBI and the BI for each subject, and whether those two assessments were completed at the same time. Please clarify in the methods section. One would expect scores to be closely correlated (as in table 3) if PTs and OTs completed both instruments at the same time.

2) Please address the differences in sex, age, and duration of time practicing between those raters in the direct observation versus the video observation group. Do you think those differences had the potential to impact results?

3) Please comment in your discussion about whether the use of the PET-MBI in the home as opposed to the inpatient setting would be likely to maintain or decrease its validity and whether you intend to study that in the future.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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