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Reviewer's report:

In the manuscript, the development and assessment of some psychometric properties is described for the self-reported general joint hypermobility instrument. The manuscript is well written and very informative, the relevance of this new instrument for use in epidemiological studies is also clear. A few suggestions:

- The sub-title "cross-sectional comparative study" doesn't really apply in these types of studies, just leave it out.

- Methods: please name the items (name 4 joints left and right, trunk) immediately under "Development of the instrument", to better understand the pilot study.

- Results/discussion: Add info of person characteristics in the subsequent paragraph about knee pain, OA and injury, numbers and % are missing. Prevalence of knee pain, OA, injury might be too low in this community sample to find associations with GJH (however, the ORs for knee pain seem to be on the verge of significance). Please add adjusted ORs for age and gender and reflect on findings in light of conflicting results mentioned in the Introduction section.

- Discussion: Could it be that the sensitivity-specificity results are less favorable for the first and second versions of the instrument because of lower patient numbers? Please reflect on that.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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