

Reviewer's report

Title: A questionnaire for diabetes related foot disease (Q-DFD) - construction and validation.

Version: 3 **Date:** 9 October 2009

Reviewer: Alistair A McInnes

Reviewer's report:

Minor revisions: page 2 Under results section, 4th line should read 'participants'
page 10 ,line 3 should read 'callus'.

page 12 line 4 should read survey's ability, etc.

page 14, line 19reported from other countries. Reference required here.

The points to consider are an appreciation of further bias re: sample for survey. In addition to being motivated to participate in the study, the other potential bias is the omission of those subjects who do not possess a telephone. (ethnic minorities, disenfranchised, who may well be significant groups who have DFD)

Rationale for search: other electronic databases could have been considered and there is no mention of the time frame that was used for the databases of CINAHL and MEDLINE.

Good points re: survey validity methodology.

Recruitment from the clinic. Perhaps this group could have given some time to consider taking part in the study.

Note : the development of the survey tool is sound and based on the principles of validation of survey instruments.

Important point to emphasise is the difficulty in identifying the presence of foot deformity. For subjects providing information via telephone, particularly those with neuropathy, there are issues in identifying areas of high pressure. Many research studies have difficulty in defining foot deformity. Particularly in relating to potential sites for ulceration. The difficulty in defining foot deformity should be highlighted in the text.

Excellent use of tables especially table 4.

Good use of flow diagram Figure 1.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests