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Reviewer's report:

This is a meticulous and well written paper which gives a comprehensive review of the limited number of PROMs in this field.

I have no major compulsory revisions to suggest.

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.

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.

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!

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 its OK to say this in a talk- but a) it might or might not happen b) whether its 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 or might be reading the paper in 2 years time). Again I'd regard this as a discretionary change.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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