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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors:

I have been reviewed carefully. It has been a pleasure to review your paper about Validation of the Chinese Manchester Foot Pain and Disability Index (C-MFPDI) among Patients with Inflammatory Arthritis but I have observed a few of methodology errors and results that it's necessary to change before to be accept it.

You can see below the recommendation

-In section method
    How did you calculate the sample size, can you include this in the text?

Page 5 The 17- item MFPDI [19, 20, 22, 29] is divided into 3 domains: pain (5 items), functional limitation (10 items) and personal appearance (2 items). The original version was 19 item, please can you modify this or explain better why use this?

Page 5 Line 39 Did you ask permission of Oxford? Please explain this in the text.

Page 6 line 44 100 participants with rheumatologist-diagnosed IA were recruited. Could be more specific, can you use some reference to the diagnosis?

Page 6 line 51 they were over the age of 21 years old. Why 21 year old? Could you explain this?

Page 7 line 7-10 The Disease Activity Score in 28-joints using ESR (DAS28-ESR) and CRP (DAS28-CRP) were calculated. Could you use some reference to this scale?

Statistical analysis

I would like to see in the text the distribution of the scores and occurrence of floor-ceiling effect.

How was it the simple about the normality? Can you include this information?

Can you include reference for this information Cronbach's alpha test
Result

I would like to read more result in this section: the correlation matrix, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin values and Barlett's test of sphericity and the item item correlation matrix.

Discussion

Page 10 line 51-56 The last two items of the MFPDI that related to the difficulty in performing work or leisure activities were excluded from the questionnaire in the present study. Can you explain more about this, I don't know why didn't use this items because your sample has people from less of 65 year old
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