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Authors’ response to reviewers comments (version 2)

Again we thank the reviewers for their helpful comments. They have been addressed as follows (reviewer comments in normal font, authors’ response in italics)

Isam Atroshi

1. The meaning of the second part of the purpose is unclear (last sentence in background):
the sentence has been changed to: The purpose of this paper is to review and synthesise the evidence on the psychometric properties of the BCTQ published to date, and to make recommendations regarding its use in practice and research.

2. There is inconsistency in how ‘symptom severity scale’ and functional status scale’ are written throughout the manuscript with the first letters sometimes being in upper case and sometimes in lower case.
Symptom Severity and Functional Status Scales have all been changed to upper case throughout the manuscript as they refer to the name of the scale

3. Construct validity: the authors use ‘r’ to refer to Cronbach alpha coefficient, which is unusual and probably incorrect.
thank you for pointing this out as this is indeed an error – it has been changed to alpha (\(\alpha\))

4. Construct validity: a high Cronbach alpha for both scales does NOT suggest that the 2 scales are separate measures: the statement claiming that should be omitted.
the sentence has been omitted as suggested

5. Construct validity: the meaning of the last sentence is unclear
we agree that this is unclear, duplicates what was stated earlier and therefore has been removed

6. Discussion, responsiveness: it may not be correct to state that the 2 studies which used only satisfied patients in calculating responsiveness ‘overestimated’ responsiveness because it may well be that the other studies underestimated responsiveness. Perhaps it would be better just to state that the responsiveness reported by those studies would be larger than that reported by the other studies.
the sentence has been altered as suggested to: ‘However in two of the studies the data on responsiveness were based on a subgroup of patients reporting greater satisfaction with surgery. Responsiveness indices in these are therefore likely to be larger than in the other studies.’

Joy Macdermid

No revisions requested