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Reviewer’s report:

Comments for manuscript "Knee Self Efficacy Scale: measurement properties and a proposed alternative scoring based on structural validity"

General comment:

I find your manuscript both well organized, well written and interesting. You have done a good job. I have only minor comments.

Title: Add that it's the Dutch version of K-SES in the title?

Abstract row 37, conclusion: I believe you should not write that the measurement properties of the K-SES-D are satisfactory, since the responsiveness for example, is not tested. I would prefer if you wrote which measurement properties that you have tested, and if the result is good or not. Then write that your exploratory FA that showed two factor solution was not confirmed in the confirmatory FA, and that testing for responsiveness is needed.

Methods:

Row 93-94: Describe the patients that acceptability was tested on, were they ACL-injured? Reconstructed? Other injuries? What questions did they get to answer?

Row 200, 112 and 116: You mention the three groups of participants, and that they are ACL injured or ACL reconstructed. I would want to know how old injuries and how long since ACL reconstruction, to understand scores and the implication of the results further ahead in the article.

Row 116: 50 patients filled out the form for the test-retest testing, 1 week between. COSMIN gruou recommends 2 weeks at least to make sure the patient doesn't remember the answers from the first time. I guess you have good reasons to have a shorter time in between, but I would like you to state why you have chosen this time interim. Also if you have considered the patients stable in condition, why is that?

Result:
Row 200-204: More descriptives of the 15 patients, diagnosis etc (if you don't add it in the methods, as mentioned before). Also "the original author", is that the Swedish researcher that developed the original questionnaire? Maybe that is obvious, but if you just add "the original K-SES author" it makes it clearer.

Result: no comments

Conclusions: I would prefer if you shorten it, go straight to the most important of your results (i.e. skip the first 3,5 rows). Use the same conclusion in text as in abstract, but I would recommend to make the abstract conclusion clearer, see comments above.

**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.
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