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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this study which aimed at adapting and validating the Foot and Ankle Ability Measure into Spanish.

The conduct of the study is very well written and the authors appear to have successfully adapted the FAAM and established a conceptual equivalence between the original and the Spanish version of the FAAN (FAAN-Sp).

Major issues

1. We know that generic quality of life measures can be insensitive in assessing disease-specific quality of life. It is notable that the inclusion criteria in the pilot and in the main validation study did not specify any disease group (diagnosis) but included all patients with foot and ankle problems. In the characteristics of the participants - table 1, there is no information about diagnosis/disease group. If this information was collected, it would be great to include it in table 1. If not, could the authors please justify the inclusion of all patients without information of their diagnosis? Please discuss whether the heterogeneity of participants will have influenced the structure of the FAAN-Sp. Could the authors also comment about the suitability of the FAAN-Sp for assessing disease-specific quality of life?

2. The next step, was the validation of the FAAN-Sp where the authors used factor analysis to identify the underlying constructs (sub-scales) in the data and describing the psychometric properties of the new measure (the FAAN-Sp). The data suggests that FAAN-Sp is a valid and reliable scale. However, having only the Spanish data and no data from the original
FAAN, it is difficult to establish psychometric equivalence between the original FAAN and the FAAN-Sp. So, while FAAN-Sp is valid and reliable, the results suggest that FAAM-Sp may have different measurement properties from the original FAAM or other versions of the FAAM. Could the authors please discuss more about this difference and its implications in multinational trials using the FAAN? Could these results be a consequence of selection bias or a limitation in the data or methods?

Minor issues
1. Could the authors please explain what they were aiming at assessing item-total correlations?
2. Did they also assess item-item correlations to test the assumption of local independency of items?
3. In table 1, please indicate what tests the p-values correspond to.
4. In table 2, could the authors please label the sub-scales?
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