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Reviewer's report:

In their article, the authors aim at describing a preliminary validation of the ORIDL instrument formerly known as GHHOS. Therefore they compare the ORIDL-scores with scores like the EQOL, the MYMOP and the SF-12. The validation of a instrument with clinical potential is a highly important task, but there are some major concerns about the paper in its present form:

- It is unclear how the ORIDL looks like. In both figures and tables it is referred to a Main Complaint Score and a Well Being Score but no further information about the ORIDL-structure is given how these scales emerge.
- Tables 1 and 4 only describe the EQOL and MYMOP scores alone. Thus for a validation study, these tables can be omitted as they do not tell the reader something about the properties of the ORIDL.
- Most of the figures only give percentage values and these can be captured within the text or in a table. Alternatively, the authors could use boxplots which provide a bit more information.
- Apart from the external validation (SF-12, EQOL, MYMOP) the authors should give information about the internal validity by means of a test-retest analysis (if possible) but at least by giving a responsiveness-analysis of the instrument by means of effect-size calculation.
- In particular, the authors should comment on bottom and ceiling effects of the ORIDL. Especially in the primary care study, the high percentage of zero’s should also be discussed with respect to the validity of the instrument.
- As the authors have data from three studies, they should describe the sensitivity of the instrument by means of subgroup analysis e.g. of primary care vs. hospital patients or by giving statistical tests for differences between diagnostic groups.
- The chapter “Choosing Timings and Targets” and the first parts of “Presenting Results” might fit better into the methods section describing the ORIDL Instrument.

I would like to see these points considered by the authors in a major revision of this paper.

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: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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