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The Editor,
BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders
BioMed Central Ltd

Dear Editor

Re: Cross-cultural validation of the Educational Needs Assessment Tool in RA in 7 European countries. MS: 1480950561481438

Thank you for your feedback on the above manuscripts. We are pleased to re-submit the above paper for publication in the BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders having addressed your comments and those raised by the second reviewer (Åsa Lundgren-Nilsson) as detailed in the next page. All changes in the revised manuscripts are in a coloured font.

We hope you are satisfied with the revisions and look forward to your views.

Sincerely yours,

Mwidimi Ndosi
Corresponding author
Editor’s comments:

1. Please highlight (with ‘tracked changes’/coloured/underlines/highlighted text) all changes made when revising the manuscript to make it easier for the Editors to give you a prompt decision on your manuscript.

   We have used a blue colour for the revised text

2. Please also ensure that your revised manuscript conforms to the journal style (http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/ifora/medicine_journals). It is important that your files are correctly formatted.

   The journal style has been followed throughout the revised manuscripts

Reviewer 2: Åsa Lundgren-Nilsson

1. Conclusions in the abstract: It needs to be clear that the ENAT is only cross-cultural valid if DIF is dealt with.

   This is addressed in the revised manuscripts

2. In the answer to my question 10 concerning thresholds, You state that when items are made into testlets that ".. threshold ordering is no longer an issue..". This is not correct. Disordering of thresholds is important and needs to be addressed; however under the testlet solution thresholds cannot be analyzed/interpreted. The answer to question 10 needs to be re-written in a way to make this clear and to avoid misunderstandings of the importance of threshold disordering.

   Answer to question 10:

   Yes, this was misleading. In the raw data threshold ordering was marginal and rescoring worsened fit, so we did not rescore disordered thresholds. All items were subsequently made into testlets, where threshold ordering cannot be interpreted in the same way. We have removed the statement about threshold ordering not being an issue.