

Author's response to reviews

Title: Measures and procedures utilized to determine the added value of microprocessor-controlled prosthetic knee joints: a systematic review

Authors:

Patrick J.R. Theeven (p.theeven@adelante-zorggroep.nl)

Bea Hemmen (bea.hemmen@mumc.nl)

Peter R.G. Brink (p.brink@mumc.nl)

Rob J.E.M. Smeets (r.smeets@adelante-zorggroep.nl)

Henk A.M. Seelen (h.seelen@adelante-zorggroep.nl)

Version: 3 **Date:** 17 September 2013

Author's response to reviews: see over

The authors thank the reviewer for his valuable comments on the manuscript entitled “*Measures and procedures utilized to determine the added value of microprocessor-controlled prosthetic knee joints: a systematic review*” (version II). We have incorporated the suggested changes in version III of this manuscript. The changes made are described below.

1) *The authors have included an illustration on the process of assigning the ICF code to each of the outcome parameters (Figure 1). This explains the process, however, there are standardised ICF linkage rules, which are well established and have been followed in numerous other papers. These should be mentioned and a comment on why a different procedure was used should be included.*

RE>> The coding of the outcome parameters was done based on the general coding guidelines that are provided by the ICF. These rules were chosen because they clearly describe the linking process closely related to how clinicians apply the ICF. Therefore, the authors have added the following sentence to the paragraph on page 6 for additional clarification: “Subsequently, an ICF code was assigned following the general coding guidelines provided by the ICF (ICF annex 2 [2]) to further indicate the specific body structure, body function, activity, participation, personal factor or environmental factor the outcome parameter focused on.” The authors have chosen not to comment on other existing linking rules as no significant difference in the eventual coding is expected. It would only distract the reader from the main message of the paper and therefore diminish the readability of the review.

2) *The authors have continued to include the eight so-called areas of interest. If it is possible to reference them to any other published paper, this should be done. If this is not possible, a comment should be included that these interest groups were developed by them.*

RE>> The authors have described the main topics of the papers included in the review, because it provides additional context to the parameters measured. These topics were composed by the authors based on the contents of the research papers investigated in the present review. The following line was added (page 6, last paragraph): “The main topics of the papers included in the present review are described by the authors as:...”.

3) *The list of references includes several papers by the same authors, with the same number of patients, with the same average age and age ranges. Presumably, these papers are papers on the same sub set of patients. Therefore the 810 participants as described by the authors on page 9 will probably not really be 810 participants but will be a smaller number depending on how many of the studies by Hafner, Theeven and Kaufman have used the same sample of patients. This should at least be acknowledged in either the results or the discussion, as it would be difficult to deconstruct at this stage of the paper.*

RE>> The authors agree with the reviewer. The following line was therefore added to the manuscript on page 9 (results section): “In all studies a cumulative total of 810 participants was investigated, not taking into account the possibility that a same subset of participants may have been described in multiple papers.”