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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the revisions of the manuscript. Before I can agree to accept the paper, I still have some questions/remarks on the authors comments:

The authors state that "it’s not possible to do a test-retest analysis on the ORIDL" as they do not have data on patients with a stable disease, which is acceptable.

In their manuscript, the authors state that "Study 1 showed substantial improvements in main complaint and well-being over 12 months using the ORIDL. Thus, I am quite surprised to hear that these improvements can not be given by means of effect sizes. Perhaps this is, because I still have not completely captured the concept of what ORIDL-Well being really means. Is there a chance to upload the complete ORIDL as an appendix to see how it works?"

Anyway: The authors state that “Effect sizes are usually calculated from mean change in score/ SD of baseline scores”, but there are other possibilities to quantify effects, e.g. by means of odds ratio, which in my opinion should be a possible way with a transition measure like the ORIDL. It should also be possible to transform these odds-ratios into “conventional” effect sizes (See the formula given in Chinn S. A simple method for converting an odds ratio to effect size for use in metaanalysis. Stat Med 2000; 19: 3127-3131) The formulas are also given in the Cochrane Handbook: http://www.cochrane.org/resources/handbook/).

In my opinion this would really enhance the quality of the paper, but I'm not quite sure if it's possible...

What next?: Accept after minor essential 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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