

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Orthopedics

**Manuscript NO:** 32833

**Title:** Reliability and validity of the Dutch version of the VISA-A questionnaire for Achilles tendinopathy and applicability to non-athletes

**Reviewer's code:** 03067293

**Reviewer's country:** Spain

**Science editor:** Jin-Xin Kong

**Date sent for review:** 2017-05-24

**Date reviewed:** 2017-05-27

**Review time:** 3 Days

| CLASSIFICATION   | LANGUAGE EVALUATION   | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT                          | CONCLUSION   |
|--|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent            | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing                 | Google Search:                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept                        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title        | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing  | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor                 |   | BPG Search:                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision                |
|  |   | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title        |  |
|  |   | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication |  |
|  |   | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism            |  |
|  |   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No         |  |

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear colleagues, First of all, I want to tell you that it has been a pleasure review your manuscript about the Dutch VISA-A scale. I think this is an interesting study about the VISA-A scale for Dutch patients. The main strength I think is the discussion about the application of this scale for sedentary patients. It is an international accepted issue which had not previously been approached from clinimetric perspective. It is well written and very structured, making it easy to read and follow. Technically is well developed: authors have referred results for SEM, SDC, that are values for improve the interpretability of the scores. Well done! Tables are correctly edited and formatted, and I think that provides relevant information for readers. However, I recognize that I'm worried about the originality of the publication, since I have previously seen the results published in: [https://pure.uva.nl/ws/files/1607599/104125\\_07.pdf](https://pure.uva.nl/ws/files/1607599/104125_07.pdf). I hope this is not a



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://** www.wjgnet.com

problem for publication. Following, these are some notes about formal changes or contents that you can consider in the review: - Page 1, but along the manuscript, you write: "Crohbach's Alpha", and is: Cronbach's Alpha. Please, review. - There are some notes with MsWord tracked changes (pag. 5). Please, delete from the main file. - In the beginning of the results section, you write: "Of 104 participans, 11 questionnaires were filled out...". Please, correct "participants" - I think it would be interesting that you provide more information about the characteristics of the studied population: level of sports, training hours, kind of disciplines...It is important when comparing different versions of the scale. - I miss a justification of the sample size used for the analysis. - You must define the meaning of FAOS; AOFAS, SF-36 first time that appear in the manuscript. Then, write the acronym. The same with HRQL! - When were the data taken? You could specify the interval time (Month/year). You write that the acquisition data were along 3.5 years in the discussion section?? Please, clarify. - Was the data collection protocol reviewed and approved by a research committee? If so, clarify it and enter it in the manuscript. - How were diagnosed the participants? By clinic only? Have they any additional US, MRI,??? - When you write: "In 15 patients, complaints had changed at re-test"...how you assess the clinical change? Which is the rationale or the instrument to affirm this. - Finally, I think that it could be interesting to explore the factor structure of the scale. What do you think about? Thanks!