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Rachel Neilan, MSc
Assistant Scientific Editor
BMC-series Journals
BioMed Central
Floor 6, 236 Gray's Inn Road
London, WC1X 8HL

Dear Ms. Neilan:


Thank you very much for your acceptance, in principle, of our manuscript. As you had requested, we have made some additional revisions in response to the suggestions from Reviewer 2. We have outlined these below (our responses are in italicized text): We have also reviewed the formatting, and believe the manuscript meets your journal’s requirements.

Response to Reviewer's report

Title: Comparing the Functional Independence Measure and the interRAI/MDS for use in the functional assessment of older adults: A review of the literature

Version: 2 Date: 8 September 2009
Reviewer: Ying-Chih Wang
Reviewer’s report:

a) Add more detailed information (i.e., findings of psychometric properties) in the Results session related to the MDS as you did in the FIM session.
Summary values were included for the MDS where possible in the results section.

b) Add more detailed information discussing the responsiveness in the Results session after "Eight articles investigated the responsiveness of the FIM and only three articles investigated the responsiveness of the MDS". What are their major findings in responsiveness index? (So that readers don't have to go to the Table and search for the answers)

Due to the large number and diversity of the studies it was often difficult aggregate the results in a meaningful way. This sentence was changed to:

“Eight articles investigated the responsiveness of the FIM and only three articles investigated the responsiveness of the MDS – there was considerably more evidence supporting the responsiveness of the FIM than the MDS.”

c) Add more detailed information regarding the construct validity in the Results session. For example, "...that the FIM has a multidimensional structure defined by three to five factors", what are those factors?

Similar to our response to b); the diversity of study methods made it difficult summarise the results; however, we were able to modify the sentence to include:

“FIM has a multidimensional structure defined by three to five factors which were often related to either the subscales within the instrument or to anatomical regions (e.g., lower or upper body) [45, 46, 50, 60].”

d) I understand the intent from the authors, but still recommend to simplify the summary Table.

We appreciate the suggestion however our goal for this paper was to give a more comprehensive presentation of our findings; therefore, we still believe the level of detail in table 3-6 is necessary

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
Declaration of competing interests:
'I declare that I have no competing interests' below.'

Sincerely,
Paul Stolee, PhD
Associate Professor, Health Studies & Gerontology
University of Waterloo