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Author’s response to reviews:

Thank you for considering the article for publication, we have made changes in accordance with reviewers excellent comments and suggestions.

1) In abstract, you used OA, KOOS, KSS, ADL first time without any elaboration: In abstract we have used abbreviations, this has been changed in Abstract, line 10, Page 1; Abstract line 14, Page 1; Abstract line 24, Page 1

2) In abstract, specify the numbers at the beginning of the sentence with text characters. For example 150, 149…: In abstract we have started sentences with numbers. We have altered the sentences so that they begin with text: Abstract Line 12, Page 1, Abstract line 17, Page 1.

3) The introduction, material-methods and result section was well designed, well analyzed, but in discussion section i think there are some points that are not fully explained:

   - In material and methods, participants with radiographic Kellgren-Lawrence (K-L) grade 3-4 were also excluded. Why? Need an explanation with reference: A sentence explaining this is added into the section of Background, line 50 page 1. Two references added.

   - In material and methods, no information is available on whether patients have right, left or bilateral osteoarthritis. I think that this can affect the level of pain and function: Information regarding this added in Results line 19, page 3

4) In results specify the numbers at the beginning of the sentence with text characters. For example 149, 85, 9…: Changed accordingly in Results lines 19,20 and 25, page 3.
5) I think that in discussion section is very short. All results should be discussed in the context of literature.

: Added in discussions accordingly with references in Discussions; below line 29

6) There are too many errors in the arrangement of the references. I think that the reference section needs to be reviewed again: Reviewed references and editorial policies, made minor changes with aid of software and we think our references are now correct.

7) The work is free of obvious errors, but, to improve its scientific impact, I suggest an English manuscript editing: In accordance with this reviewers and the two other reviewers comments the manuscript underwent an English language manuscript editing with many minor changes throughout the whole text.