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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr. C Montano

Journals Editorial Office (JEO)

Point to point reply manuscript SSMR-D-18-00007

Knee Self-Efficacy scale: measurement properties and a proposed alternative scoring based on structural validity.

Thank you for the positive review of our manuscript. In this point to point reply we will address the concerns raised by the editor. Points raised by the editor are copied below, followed by our response.

1) The readers will benefit if the flow of the topic is maintained in the Data analysis and Results section. Eg- In Data analysis section, reliability has been discussed first followed by validity but in the Results section, this has been reversed.

Thank you for drawing attention to this inconsistency. As suggested by the editor we have now maintained the topic flow throughout the manuscript. In different sections of the manuscript we have made changes accordingly. The flow of the topic is now consistent as follows: structural validity, internal consistency, reliability, measurement error, and construct validity using hypothesis testing.
Page 5: Measurement properties line 100-101 now read: The following COSMIN measurement properties will be described: structural validity, internal consistency, reliability, measurement error, and construct validity using Hypothesis testing.

Page 7: The section Data analyses has now been rephrased accordingly. We now describe the following procedures: Structural validity, Reliability (internal consistency, test-retest reliability, and measurement error), and construct validity using hypothesis testing. References have been adjusted accordingly.

2) It would benefit the readers if sub-headings are used. Eg- Construct Validity, Criterion Validity, Test Retest Reliability

As suggested, subheadings have been used in the results section. The heading read: structural validity (page 9), reliability (page 10), construct validity (hypothesis testing) (page 11).

3) Please explain the implication of the revised CFA model (the one with 10 items) to the reader.

To explain the implication of the revised CFA model we have added the following lines to the conclusion (Conclusion, page 15, line 354-357):

These findings imply that both scales measure clearly distinguishable concepts relevant for the physical therapist involved in the rehabilitation of patients after an ACLR. As such, both self-efficacy in knee function tasks and self-efficacy beliefs in future knee function give relevant information for the rehabilitation process.

4) Please specify the model used for ICC (Two Way Mixed effects/Two way random effects/One way random effect)

In page 8, line 181 the following line is added: The two way random effects model was used.

We hope that we have now addressed all concerns raised by the editor to your satisfaction and that the manuscript is now fit for publication.

Kind regards,

Wim van Lankveld

HAN University of Applied Sciences.