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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for allowing me to review this study following manuscript revisions.

The author's have adequately responded to my comments. However, I do have the following comments:

1. The title could be revised. Would something such as the following be more appropriate:

2. 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

2. P4 L90: should 'the epidemiology of' or 'the prevalence of' be added before 'radiographic'?

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

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

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

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


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

9. P11 L 278: please change 'is' to 'was'.

10. P11 L279: consider changing 'indicating' to 'so'.

11. P11 L281-2: please consider rewriting the sentence - it is awkward.

12. P13 L324-5: please check that LTA should be LFA?
13. P14 L350: Do you mean 'discordance between the prevalence of radiographic OA versus combined radiographic OA with symptoms…'?


15. References: please check journal abbreviations for ref 5, 8 and 10 and additional full stop at ref 39.

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