MAJOR REVISIONS

Abstract
The issue in relation to a better link being forged between the study aims and conclusion has been satisfactorily addressed by the authors.

Background
Regarding the reasons why the authors specifically targeted ‘clinical assessment of hand problems in older adults’ this has been sufficiently addressed by the authors by the inclusion of additional text. Please see minor comments regarding small suggestion in relation to wording.

The clarification in relation to the specific aim of this study has been clarified by the inclusion of additional text.

Methods
I agree with the authors’ decision to place justification in relation to the constitution of the purposeful sample into the discussion section.

The authors have addressed the issue in relation to the development of the Delphi survey headings.

Good justification and referencing support has been included to support the use of a nine point numerical scale and the addition of the text in relation to the verbal descriptions have further enhanced the information provided in this section.

Discussion
Good justification has been added to support the fresh approach taken in this work and the decision not to examine previously used tools during the development of the analysis framework.

The issue in relation to ‘sample size’ has been adequately addressed.
The issue in relation to ‘future work’ has been adequately addressed.
Background

There are many valid and reliable self-report measures for assessing the hand, for example, [8,9,10].

(for example, the Southampton examination schedule [13] and the Sequential Occupational Dexterity Assessment (SODA) [14]).

I do not think that “for example” is required in these sentences.

All comments regarding minor revisions in this section have been addressed by the authors.

Methods

I am suggesting that you might consider leaving out the “for example”.
To control the amount of data produced and to provide a structure for participants, a framework of sections and headings was developed based on the British Association of Hand Therapists (BAHT) Standard on Assessment [2012] and using recommendations from the hand therapy literature (for example, [21,22]).

The figures have been well drafted.

Analysis

The additional text included relating to the way in which the authors analysed the data has improved the clarity of this section.

The authors have added a reference supporting the use of the ‘decision rules’.

Discussion

I am not sure that “for example” is required here?

There are many sources of expert advice and guidance on the clinical assessment of musculoskeletal conditions in general and specified single musculoskeletal diagnoses for example [29-31],

All other minor amendments have been considered and the authors have satisfactorily addressed the issues raised in the first review.

There is still at least one “e.g.” in the manuscript but this abbreviation may be acceptable maybe the authors would check with the BMC editors as in some journals it is perfectly acceptable to use “e.g.”.
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