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Author’s response to reviews:

Thank you for your prompt response to our resubmission, and for your helpful feedback.

The abstract should be updated to reflect the findings of the rest of the paper. The abstract results still report 'excellent' reliability instead of 'good' and could better reflect the magnitude of the associated error margins relative to the absolute clinical measure, as has been amended in the rest of the paper. The rest of the paper captures the relatively wide margin of error and places this well into context regarding using a range of measurements for PAD clinically.

Thank you for pointing out that oversight. The abstract has been amended, and the relevant sections now read:

'Results
Intra-tester reliability of the ABI was found to be good (ICC: 0.80), however sub-group analysis of participants with and without diabetes found that ABI was slightly less reliable in people with diabetes (ICC: 0.78) than in those without (ICC: 0.82). The relatively large limits of agreement (-0.16 to 0.16), standard error of measurement (0.03 overall, 0.04 for the diabetes group), and minimal detectable change (0.08 overall, 0.11 for the diabetes group) suggest that a large change in ABI is required for it to demonstrate a true change rather than the result of measurement variability. The minimal detectable change for the ABI was 0.08 overall, and 0.11 for the diabetes group.
Conclusions
The ABI demonstrated good reliability in all groups analysed. However, the wide limits of agreement and considerable standard error of measurement obtained support the use of multiple methods of vascular assessment for ongoing monitoring of lower limb vascular status.’

Line 143 should also be amended to remove the reference to 'excellent' reliability.
Thank you. The sentence has been amended:
‘All ICC values were interpreted according to cut-offs suggested by Portney and Watkins (29), in which >0.75 denotes good reliability, 0.50 to 0.75 suggests moderate reliability, and values below 0.50 represents poor reliability.’