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Reviewer's report:

General Comments

In general I am satisfied with the statistical analyses reported in this paper that reports a cross-cultural adaptation and validation of an Arabic version of the Leeds BD-QoL. I do have some questions and comments related to improving communication.

Major Compulsory Revisions

0. External construct validity, Abstract and other place. If external construct validity was assessed by estimating the correlation between Arabic-QoL with severity score, a correlation of 0.4 (Abstract, Results, second line from bottom) is not all that impressive: BD-QoL accounts for just 16% of the variation in severity score. How does the Leeds BD-QoL version correlate with severity score? It is important to include this information and address this issue in the manuscript.

1. Statistical analyses. I was unable to find statistical procedures listed for different comparisons (for example, Severity Score, p 11).

Minor Essential Revisions

0. Abstract and Discussion, one-dimensional and uni-dimensional. If the Arabic version of the BD QoL was one-dimensional or uni-dimensional, does that mean it measures one thing? If so, why not say that?

1. Method, Clinical Severity Score, p 6. I did not understand what (to define) referred to. Does it mean that each category of symptoms would be defined later in the manuscript? Is there a maximum severity score, or a typical maximum score?

2. Methods, Leeds BD-QoL, p 6. It is important to state whether permission was granted, not simply that permission was requested.

3. Methods, discussion of QoL translation, p8. It would help if the Leeds BD-QoL questions are referred to. It appears that Table 2 has the items, but it would help to refer the reader to this Table.

4. Results, p 12, bottom. I would include the entire translated version of Q21 to
help the reader.

5. Percentages, throughout the manuscript and Table 1. Is 0.1% all that important? Percentages can be rounded to the nearest integer. They will also be easier to read.

6. P values, throughout the manuscript. P values greater than 0.01 can be rounded to two (2) decimal places.

7. Table 2. Is the wording of the questions from the original Leeds QoL or the Arabic QoL questionnaire? This might be the place to list the original wording and the translated Arabic version actually asked so that the reader can see the changes.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests.