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Dear Dr. Graham,

Thank you for your e-mail. We are grateful to both referees for reviewing our manuscript for the second time. We found that their suggestions could improve the paper further. Thus the following point-by-point changes were made to the manuscript.

**Reviewer: Dr. J.J. Rasker**
Discretionary revisions:
Page 11 line 5 the authors did not understand my comment: or the total series of patients studied 68% were women. If 80% of the subjects are working, it means that also a majority of the Iranian women are working. Do you consider working of women as working outside their homes, or is household work also considered as work. That needs clarification and a very simple answer.
Thank you. This was clarified:
At the time of enrollment, 80% of the subjects were working (considering household work also as work for women), 12% were retired, and 8% had stopped working because of their knee pain.

**Reviewer: Dr. José M. Quintana**
Major Compulsory Revisions
I understand from their answers that the authors did not contact with the original authors of the questionnaire to present them the final English translation of the Iranian version. This should be done.
Done
I find that the appropriate place to include some data about the discriminative validity of the AIMS2 is in this article, better than in a responsiveness manuscript.
We agree with the reviewer but unfortunately the manuscript was submitted already. Sorry for this.
There is no discussion about the factor analysis results. It deserves some comments pointing out the main limitations of those results.
The following paragraph was added to the Discussion:
A three-factor solution was extracted from the factor analysis of the Persian AIMS2 that jointly accounted for the 67.5% of the total variance. In fact the result was satisfactory and consistent with the theoretical basis for the original conceptual model of the instrument. A German study also confirmed the postulated three-factor structure for the AIMS2 with a physical, physiological and social dimension, explaining 48.5%, 13.9% and 6.8% of the variation, respectively [20]. Similarly an Italian study indicated that the factor analysis provided a three-factor health status model explaining 63.5% of the variance observed [17].
The authors do not provide with data to support a sentence such as “Due to the similar results of the psychometric assessment achieved with the original AIMS2 and the Persian version, a similar responsiveness may be assumed for this version with caution till additional clinical studies confirm this assumption in the future.” It should be removed.
This was removed as recommended.
No limitations of the study are included in the Discussion.

The following paragraph was added to Discussion as recommended:

This study has several limitations. Perhaps the main concern is that this study did not provide evidence for responsiveness to change or other psychometric tests (e.g. discriminant validity). Secondly, the statistical analysis was limited. For instance, to indicate the factor structure of the instrument it would also be interesting to carry out confirmatory factor analysis as well. The future studies could focus on other psychometric properties of the questionnaire and also on different applications of the AIMS2 among Iranian patients.

Hope you find the corrections satisfactory.
I wish you all the best.
Kind regards
Ali Montazeri