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Author’s response to reviews:
Reviewer #1: Thank you for allowing me to review this study following manuscript revisions. The author’s have adequately responded to my comments. Thank you, we are extremely grateful for your time in helping us clarify our manuscript for the readership of the Journal of Foot and Ankle Research.

However, I do have the following comments:
1. The title could be revised. Would something such as the following be more appropriate:

The effect of variation in interpretation of the La Trobe radiographic foot atlas on the prevalence of foot OA in older women: the Chingford general population cohort

Thank you, we agree that is a good point following the revisions made to submission 1. We have amended the title on the manuscript and online submission to:

“The effect of variation in interpretation of the La Trobe radiographic foot atlas on the prevalence of foot osteoarthritis in older women: the Chingford general population cohort”
2. P4 L90: should 'the epidemiology of' or 'the prevalence of' be added before 'radiographic’?

Thank you for pointing this out. We have added ‘definitions for prevalence of radiographic foot OA…’

3. Text on P5 L118 appears to repeat P124 L124 (i.e. as with other radiographic atlases).

Ah yes we have now deleted ‘as with other radiographic atlases’ on pg 5, line 125.

4. P7 L154-155: is the SD of BMI correct (ie: 44.75)? Please also be consistent with decimal point usage.

Thank you for spotting this, it should be 4.75. We have changed this to 4.8 to be consistent with the decimal points and checked that decimal points are to one place throughout the manuscript.

5. P7 L 159: 'All radiographs were scored…' may be better placed in the section 'Radiographic scoring of foot osteoarthritis'.

Yes we agree and have moved that sentence to line 180.

6. P9 L208: please add 1 decimal point to '81%'.

This has been added.


Thank you for highlighting this following our revisions. The sentence has now been removed from line 215.

“Intra-rater reliability was calculated by overall agreement (percentage of observed exact agreement) and weighted kappa statistic”.

8. P11 L272: the Menz et al study was conducted in Melbourne, Victoria (rather than North West Adelaide).

Thank we for pointing that out. We have changed the text accordingly.
9. P11 L 278: please change 'is' to 'was'.
This has been amended.

10. P11 L279: consider changing 'indicating' to 'so'.
Yes we have changed this.

11. P11 L281-2: please consider rewriting the sentence - it is awkward.
The lower estimate produced by Wilder et al. [41] may be due to the fact that their scoring was based on the traditional Kellgren and Lawrence scale which is not as sensitive to radiographic foot OA as the LFA [16].

12. P13 L324-5: please check that LTA should be LFA?
Thank you for spotting that. We have changed LTA to LFA.

13. P14 L350: Do you mean 'discordance between the prevalence of radiographic OA versus combined radiographic OA with symptoms…'?
Thank you for checking, this should read as:
“Additionally, in our study, OA was defined radiographically which has been shown to lead to higher estimates than other definitions such as ‘self-reported OA’ and ‘symptomatic OA’ (combined radiographic OA with symptoms)”.

We added that sentence in response to reviewer 2's comments at the previous submission. We are happy to remove it, based on your comment, however would first seek advice from the editor as to whether or not we should delete the end sentence.
15. References: please check journal abbreviations for ref 5, 8 and 10 and additional full stop at ref 39.

Thank you for pointing these out. It is a problem with Endnote that defaults to BMC format. We have now manually corrected these.

16. Table 2: Is there a rogue symbol in the row 'Both - All 5 joints - Dorsoplantar'?

Thank you for spotting that. We have removed the rogue symbol.