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Dear Professor Menz,

Please find a point-by-point list of areas highlighted by the reviewers for correction of the manuscript and the actions taken to address them below.

**Reviewer 1**

**Point 1:** Minor essential revision: The Juvenile Arthritis Foot Disability Index is referred to on page 6 (and discussed further) as being CTT based and RA specific. However this was developed for use in what is now called Juvenile Idiopathic Arthritis which describes a different set of diseases from Adult RA. I think the confusion arises because historically the North American term for Juvenile Idiopathic Arthritis was Juvenile Rheumatoid Arthritis. So this tool is disease specific - but not RA specific. One further minor point- some consistency is also required for the name/abbreviation for this PROM - the original paper refers to The Juvenile Arthritis Foot Disability Index whereas the heading on page 12 refers to The Juvenile Arthritis Disability Index. The abbreviation used is however JAFI. Authors’ original nomenclature should be used.

Amendments have been made to the classification of the PROM as a JIA disease-specific and foot-specific PROM. References to the JAFI as the ‘Juvenile Arthritis Disability Index’ have been amended to ‘Juvenile Arthritis Foot Disability Index’.
**Point 2:** Minor essential revision - the abbreviation ICF is introduced without explanation in the text on p12 - but the full name "International Classification for Functioning, Disability and Health" is used further down the page without reference to an abbreviation - clarification/consistency needed.

Where the abbreviation ICF is first introduced, it is preceded by the full name, "International Classification for Functioning, Health and Disability."

**Point 3:** Discretionary revisions - I suspect this paper will be used mainly by those from a clinical background (looking to use the tools in a critical way) rather than domain experts in PROM design. As such I'd prefer less use of some technical jargon- eg "nomothetic" and "idiographic"- which the reviewer had to look up!

All perceived technical jargon has been removed where possible, including the words ‘idiographic’ and ‘nomothetic’.

**Point 4:** I'd also have a personal preference for not including phrases like "A PROM meeting all these requirements is currently being developed by the lead author"- in the abstract and the conclusion. I think it’s OK to say this in a talk - but a) it might or might not happen b) whether it’s true is a matter for further peer review and c) a paper should stand alone and not refer to future events (not least because someone might or might be reading the paper in 2 years time). Again, I'd regard this as a discretionary change.

The above referred to phrase has been removed.

**Reviewer 2**

**Point 1:** Major Compulsory Revisions

The PRISMA statement (Moher et al 2009, BMJ and Liberati et al 2009 BMJ) has a checklist of items for authors when reporting systematic reviews, which it is recommended that the current authors check their systematic review against. In addition, the Equator network recommends that the PRISMA flow diagram is included in submissions of systematic reviews to map out the number of records identified, included and excluded, and the reasons for exclusions. It is recommended that the authors include a flow diagram. It is available from the following website by clicking on PRISMA Flow Diagram and PRISMA checklist. [http://www.equator-network.org/resource-centre/library-of-health-research-reporting/](http://www.equator-network.org/resource-centre/library-of-health-research-reporting/)

The manuscript submitted has been checked against the PRISMA checklist. A flow diagram (figure 1) has been included, as recommended.

**Point 2:** Minor Essential Revisions

The title ‘The Rheumatoid foot’ and the term ‘RA foot’ within the text (pages 5, 6, 15, 19) should not be used as these terms have not been defined; RA is a complex disease that manifests itself in the foot in many different ways. Therefore it is recommended that the authors use ‘the foot in patients with rheumatoid arthritis’ or ‘the foot in RA’.

Expressions such as ‘RA foot’ and ‘rheumatoid foot’ have been replaced with ‘the foot with RA’ where necessary.
Point 3: Discretionary Revisions

The literature review of foot pathology affecting patients with RA in the ‘background’ section could contain more relevant, up to date and robust references that are available to support the authors comments.

‘Robust’ references, such as Grondal et al (2008) and Rojas-Villarraga et al (2009) are included in the manuscript.

In ensuring that the systematic review meets and has been conducted in accordance with the PRISMA guidelines and referencing it, I have also had to amend the references somewhat. This is evidenced via tracked amendments.

I would like to thank the reviewers for their construction feedback and helpful suggestions. I look forward to receiving your decision.

Yours faithfully,

Mr Steven Walmsley