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Reviewer’s report:

Overall Comments
Relevance: I think this study certainly is valuable and is one that is important to be conducted and produced to be able to provide key psychometric properties for a translated version of the FAAM. These types of studies are necessary to ensure translate versions of tests are accurate, reliable, and valid as their original counterparts. The relevance of the study is established in the introduction and I would agree with the authors that this study has true scientific merit as a meaningful study.

Balance: The hypothesis is well defined.

Clarity: The clarity of the manuscript is difficult at times. It is apparent that the authors are foreign and as a result the sentence structure is not always in proper English. This is particularly apparent in lines 72-73, 83-85, 222. They may benefit from Rob helping to improve sentence structure and grammar to make a clearer translation in English in these parts.

Specific Comments:
Title: Title is appropriate.

Abstract: Abstract is appropriate length and succinct with pertinent information covered. It efficiently conveys the main message of the study and conveniently relays the results in an easily interpretable manner.

Introduction: The introduction is effective in establishing the relevance and need for the study. I think that in lines 82-84, it should be considered to elaborate on the 14 instruments that do have evidence, but what the current limitations of that evidence is. I think the authors have correctly identified MDC, score error, and MCID values as important in interpreting patient scores. It may be beneficial to briefly describe these terms and why they are of interest in interpreting the usefulness of a questionnaire. Otherwise the introduction is effective in establishing this as a worthy and publishable study.

Materials and Methods: The methodology of this study is a strength of the study. Specifically there were very appropriate methods used and explained in regards to cross-cultural adaptation. The authors have written this section very well with clear and concise description of methodology that is supported by the guidelines of AAOS. I think the patients are appropriately described. I like the use of Table 1 to describe the diagnosis and location of patient symptoms. Perhaps a bit more detail and definition of the diagnoses would be helpful in the text of the patient
The authors appropriately use an alpha correction to reduce the likelihood of type I error in their interpretations and appropriate statistical measures to evaluate internal consistency, reliability, SEM, and MDC. However, in line 190, I would recommend more clearly defining patients who “were not expected to a rapid significant improvement”.

Results: The authors appropriately describe findings. The use of the tables are well done. Interpretation of the results is also appropriate.

Discussion: The authors do a good job of relating their findings to those of previous work and literature. They validate their findings with sound methodology. They also effectively explain any differences noted in their findings from previous literature. They identify potential ceiling and floor affects but how the two subscales complement each other. The authors do recognize the potential limitations of their study. Particularly, it would be ideal to have computed MCID values to be able to interpret scores. This is a logical next step for future study.

Conclusion: Appropriate based on findings of the study

Bibliography: Appropriate.

Artwork: N/A

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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