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Dear Dr. Tomohiro Okura,

We thank you and the reviewers for your insightful comments. Following is a detailed response to each of the comments made by the reviewers to our revised manuscript: “Translation and Validation of the Arab Version of the Late-Life Function and Disability Instrument: A Cross Sectional Study”. As you will note we addressed all the comments made by the reviewers. We hope this will clear the way to publication in your journal.

We should note that to the best of our knowledge it appears that there is no previously validated, comprehensive instrument for assessing function and disability in Arabic. In addition, the current study is unique as to the best of our knowledge; it is the first study to examine the internal consistency of each domain of the LLFDI in a version other than the original English questionnaire. Furthermore only one other study examined the absolute reliability of the LLFDI.

In response to the reviewer’s comment regarding the fact that one Arabic dialect may not be understood by individuals in different Arab nations, we re-examined the translation with several experts. We now realize that the translation was into the standard literary language (and not the spoken language) which is understood by most Arab speaking individuals. In addition to the reported data, following the comments made by the second reviewer, we also presented the translated questionnaire to some Arabic speaking individuals from other areas of Israel (e.g. the West bank) and to individuals from Arab countries bordering Israel. All of them reported that the items were well understood. We corrected the text regarding the language used, accordingly.

We believe this work is important to the readership of your journal and would be honored if you considered it for publication.

Also attached is a file with the manuscript and the revisions noted in 'track changes'.

Sincerely,

Dr. Michal Elboim Gabizon.
Comment by reviewer 1:

**Reviewer's report:**
The revised manuscript is much improved and the authors have responded to all major comments.

**Response**
Thank you for your supportive comment.

**Comment 1**
Line 75, page 5- typo LLFDU should be LLFDI.
**Response**
Corrected.

**Comment 2**
Line 259 page 13. Haely et al. should be Haley et al.
**Response**
Corrected.

**Comment 3**
Line 298, page 15. Beauchamo should be Beauchamp.
**Response**
Corrected.

**Comment 4**
Line 310 page 15. "Higher function and ability (less difficulty and fewer limitations)..." Please be specific here and refer to the scales being discussed.
**Response**
Accordingly, the wording was changed in lines 308-9 to , higher scores in both the function and disability components "

**Comment 5**
Line 318 page 16. Again, specify the component and dimension.
**Response**
We corrected by specifying the component and dimension of the tool. See line 291-294.

**Comment 6**
There are some minor English errors/typos throughout- please review carefully prior to publication. For example, line 294 the "in" should be changed to "and" (i.e., TUG and the limitation dimension).
**Response**
We have carefully re-read the paper and believe we have corrected all minor English errors/typos

**Comment 7**
I would recommend including the translated scale as an appendix to facilitate its widespread use and uptake.
**Response**
We will be happy to do so, but will leave it to the editor’s discretion.
Comments by review 2

In response to the reviewer’s comment regarding the fact that one Arabic dialect may not be understood by individuals in different Arab nations, we re-examined the translation with several experts. We now realize that the translation was into the standard literary language (and not the spoken language) which is understood by most Arab speaking individuals. In addition to the reported data, following the comments made by the second reviewer, we also presented the translated questionnaire to some Arabic speaking individuals from other areas of Israel (e.g. the West bank) and to individuals from Arab countries bordering Israel. All of them reported that the items were well understood. We corrected the text regarding the language used, accordingly.

In reference to the second comment, as some of the Arab individuals and particularly the older female subjects are traditional, it is reasonable that some of them may need help in reading the questioner. It should also be noted that the developers of the LLFDI recommended that the tool be applied during a face to face interview rather than by self-administration. Therefore we believe that the fact that some of the participants required help reading the questionnaire (as reported in the limitation section) is not a problematic issue.