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Reviewer's report:

Thanks for the opportunity to review this paper
In relation to the review questions:
1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   - yes well defined
   - questions related to psychometric properties and respondent burden.
   - in my opinion, respondent burden questions were overwhelmed by data and psychometric properties. The article did not seem to deal with issues of respondent burden of CRIS, respondent burden of a CAT, etc

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   - methods are appropriate for psychometric properties article, but in my opinion suffer from presentation of too many findings, and not enough sifting and discussion of relevant aspects

3. Are the data sound?
   - data appear sound to me

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   - I did not note ethics committee approval information - presumably this is in a related article

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   - yes somewhat supported by the data, but could have more substance (For example, the hypotheses related to employment, housing, and QoL changes after one year. The discussion about 1 year changes barely mentions employment, doesn't explicitly mention housing and QoL, and introduces marital status).

Likewise, the authors attribute the lack of relationship to short time frame and low numbers, but these seem quite substantial in comparison to other studies. This is an important finding, with considerable relevance to the substance of the measures being evaluated requires, and I think requires more attention.
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
yes - as a psychometric properties paper

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes it is clearly one of a number of studies

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
yes (though in my opinion requires more discussion / interpretation and less data)

9. Is the writing acceptable?
mostly - in my copy the figure numbers did not correspond.
- I found the article very complicated - field study, cohort study, administration study, cohort A, cohort B, cohort C.
- Some confusing sentences:
P2 abstract - methods first sentence is confusing
P5 ICF title incorrect
P7 second last sentence - edit
P7 (and throughout) "data" is plural - should be "data were used"
P9 second sentence under study measures - edit
P9 capitalisation and abbreviation of QOLS

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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