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Reviewer’s report:

General
The authors have done a nice job of revising this manuscript, however I have suggested a few small revisions below.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

Page 10, Content validity: The development of the FAAM and the FADI are intertwined and this should be described as such. Martin and colleagues developed these instruments (first as the FADI, later refined as the FAAM) from patient and expert perspectives.

Page 14, Line 16: The last sentence of this paragraph is misleading. You are performing a systematic review of the clinimetric properties of these survey instruments. The gold standard for the development and refinement of such instruments is to use item response analysis. Your statement completely discounts statistical analysis from survey development in favor of a patient-centered approach only. Please revise to indicate the importance of both approaches.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)


What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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