

Reviewer's report

Title: Assessing the order of magnitude of outcomes in single-arm cohorts through systematic comparison with corresponding cohorts: An example from the AMOS study

Version: 3 **Date:** 16 January 2008

Reviewer: Wolfgang Weidenhammer

Reviewer's report:

The latest version of the manuscript has been clearly improved in most aspects. The additional analyses (sensitivity analyses) as well as the statements on limitations are a valuable contribution to the conclusiveness of the methodological approach. Unfortunately this comes along with the impression that it might be a little bit more difficult for the reader to follow the essential line. But due to the complexity I'm afraid that this has to be accepted as it is.

Minor Essential Revisions:

Abstract, Conclusions: I have doubts in which way the results argue for the conclusion that SF-36 is a useful outcome measure for AM.

Methods, page 3: I suggest to delete the words in parentheses (the languages understood ...). This should be taken for granted if you decide to include these languages.

Results, page 6, first paragraph: (Table 1, Additional file 2) is confusing. Better (Table 1, for details see also additional file 2).

4th paragraph: The 85 C-cohorts... correct? or 84 cohorts?

After Discussion section include a short Conclusions section. At the end of the paper readers expect a main message (like in the abstract).

Table 2: '50-per' '25-per' should be explained in the legend (or in the list of abbreviations).

Table 4: The percentages in each row do not add up to 100%. Please check for this or give explanations.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

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.