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Responses to final reviewer comments of Richard Benedict, 23 May 2011

Many thanks for these final comments. We have completed the following final revisions to the manuscript.

In the Discussion, the section on explaining the poor sensitivity of CDR memory measures, authors should note that CDR has no measure of visual recall which is the most sensitive memory test in the MACFIMS battery.

We have added the following sentence to the middle of paragraph 4 of the Discussion: “Additionally, the CDR System has no measure of visual recall, as included in the MACFIMS and that may be particularly sensitive in this population.” (Page 16, 2nd paragraph).

In the Conclusion, the authors must qualify the statement "The CDR System measures showed good psychometric properties and were ....." by noting that most of the components but not all, or the non-memory components.

We have revised the first sentence of the conclusion to state: “The CDR System measures of attention, psychomotor/information processing speed, complex information processing speed and a global composite, showed good psychometric properties and were related to other measures of cognition and to disability.” (Page 17, Section Conclusions, 1st sentence).

We have revised the conclusions in the abstract to read: “Preliminary validation of the CDR System indicated that for most, but not all measures psychometric properties were adequate and the measures were related to disability (EDSS and MSFC) and other measures of cognition.” (Page 4, last paragraph).

We have taken care to meet the Editorial Requirements regarding Tables and Reference Citations.

In the text to Table 5 (page 31) ‘RRMS’ has been deleted as it was written twice, and in the text to Table 6 (page 32, last line) ‘sped’ has been changed into ‘speed’.

Best regards,

On behalf of the authors,

Peter Joseph Jongen, neurologist