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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:
1. I would like for the authors to clarify some of the information they presented regarding the ICF. Specifically, the total number of categories and the number of components. The authors have skipped the “personal factors” component and while not classified in the current version of the ICF, still is part of the conceptual model.

2. In the assessment section under material and methods, I would like to know what the experience level of the medical specialists who scored the ICF Core Set in terms of years of experience in OA clinical care and/or research. As the scorers only had a one-day workshop on the ICF, the scorers nevertheless must have the reliability and competency to rate the ICF categories. Under the same section, the authors mentioned that the WOMAC and SF-36 could have been administered by the assessors for those individuals who were “illiterate”. Moreover, environmental factors can influence a patient’s functioning level and not necessarily “life”.

3. Why was education duration and disease duration reported using median instead of mean? How did the distribution of these variables looked like?

4. In the section “Activities and participation component” (p 13), make sure to put the exact reference for the “ICF book”. Also, while I understand the distinction made in this study between “activities” and “participation”, the logic behind the ICF categories included in each is confusing. For example, d640 doing housework could be considered as participation because it is indeed an “involvement in a life situation”. On the other hand, categories d470 using transportation and d475 driving as categories belonging to chapter 4 of the activities and participation component of the ICF were considered by the authors to be under participation when it appear to pertain to an individual task. My overall question would be how this separation benefits the study particularly when distinction between activities and participation domains cannot be made clearer? Also, this separation could have affected the internal consistency/reliability for each group of domains (per component).
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