Reviewer 1#

1. The authors have performed an excellent study with an interesting research question and meticulous investigation. Overall, an impressive study.

   Answer: We would like to express our gratitude to reviewer, as your comments have improved our manuscript.

2. I have only 1 minor comment to the methods used in the repeated measurements analysis. The variance of the repeated measurements is not mentioned, and should be provided along with the mean. And since the repeatability measurements are performed on only 10 patients, the data is usually nor considered normally distributed, and therefore it may be better to provide the median and range of the measurement instead of the mean and SD. On a personal preference towards repeated measurements analysis, using the Pearson's correlation coefficient or the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) only provides information on the correlation between the 2 measurements and not the absolute difference between the measurements. Personally, I prefer to use the methods of Bland and Altman with the 95 % Limit of agreement which refers to the difference between the measurements and thus the reliability of the measurements, which is the purpose of performing repeated measurements. However, this is just a personal note and not needed in for publication of this study.

   Answer: For repeated measurements analysis, median and range of the measurements were provided as requested. Q1 and Q3 data was also provided. The Table 3 was updated by including all data. As

outlined by the reviewer, the Pearson correlation test was adopted for reliability analysis, with a higher Pearson correlation coefficient (r ranging from 0 to 1) indicating a higher reliability.