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Reviewer’s report:

General
The authors have developed a novel questionnaire to specifically assess hallucinations in Parkinson’s disease (UM-PDHQ). Using the UM-PDHQ, they demonstrated the clinical features of hallucinations of PD patients in a pilot study. I have the following comments on this paper.

- Major Compulsory Revisions
1) It is unclear whether the UM-PDHQ is intended to be a questionnaire for self-completion by the patients, care giver or a clinician-administered interview. The authors should specify this. There are some difficult questions to answer accurately in the UM-PDHQ. Could all patients answer the entire questionnaire?

2) The authors include the PD patients of all ages and in all stages of the disease in this study. But there is a lack of information of demographic features in Table 1. Could the authors provide the range of age or H&Y stage of patients as well as mean value and standard deviation.

3) The authors concluded that hallucinators were clearly more anxious (page 12 line 11), because, the PD patients distressing hallucinations required treatment with antidepressants more frequently. The authors discussed that this result was consistent with the previous report by Inzelberg et al. that depressed symptoms required a treatment in half their patients with auditory hallucinations. Were the hallucinators in this study more anxious or depressed? Anxiety and depression are different mood conditions even though they influence each other. The authors should specify these.

4) The authors indicated that there was no difference of MMSE between hallucinators and non-hallucinators in their study, but many studies have reported a positive association of hallucinations with cognitive decline or dementia in PD patients. Could the authors provide each prevalence number of dementia patients in hallucinators and non-hallucinators group? And, could the author discuss it in their discussion?

- Minor Essential Revisions
1) The authors used "Mini Mental Status Examination (MMSE)" in the abbreviation, but "Mini Mental State Examination" is broadly used. The authors
should change it.
2) The authors should correct the references as BMC neurology reference style

What next?
- Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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

Quality of written English
- Acceptable

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