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Reviewer's report:

General

-Interesting study regarding OA in general practice--
-Some conclusions seem slightly exaggerated: A correlations of R=.49 or .59 cannot be called high (see abstract results and results)
-The English needs correcting by a native speaker
-Statistics: has been corrected for multiple comparisons?
Suggestion: By regression analysis the weight of certain factors may be clarified

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

page 2 results: Correlations are not high, but may be apparent.
page 5: how were patients selected? how many were excluded? how many refused?
Can the selection method explain the differences in male and female patients regarding diagnosis of hip and knee OA?
page 6 line 4: were the AIMS2-SF validated in Germany?
page 6-7 statistics: was corrected for multiple comparisons? (p values of .05 are used to show statistical significance)
the authors are looking for determinants, why is no regression analysis performed?
page 7: Results first lines: women were significantly overrepresented regarding knee OA and men regarding hip OA. this has certainly influenced your results. apart from this men were older (and had shorter disease duration, maybe ns).
page 7, table 2: could you add the possible range of the different measures? So that a reader not accustomed to these values can see at once how large the range is of your patients
Table 3: the differences between men and women could be explained by the fact that more women had knee OA. it would be wise to correct for diagnosis, before making any conclusion.
table 4: it would have been interesting to know whether these figures are different for hip OA and for knee OA, as one would expect.
here regression analysis could have helped to know which determinants were most important.
page 10: line 11: did the authors assume that doctors are influenced by the pain complaints more than by the X-ray findings? looking at your findings the referee would suggest that the x-rays were influencing the opinion of the doctor very much.

ad discussion: there is a large litterature regarding psychological and social studies and factors in OA. it might be good when the authors look in Medline and compare their findings with these in litterature.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

**What next?:** Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes
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