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Reviewer's report:

Comments:

1. The title accurately reflects the content of the study. The abstract conveys the results and conclusions as they were in the manuscript (see recommendations).

2. The objectives of the study were the translation to Portuguese of the CPCHILD questionnaire and its cross-cultural adaptation for the Brazilian population. Both objectives were clearly stated by the authors.

3. The authors stated that they utilized the methodology recommended by the "American Association of Orthopedic Surgeons Outcomes Committee" which is basically related to the work of Guillemin and co-authors. This is not the only proposed means of achieving a cross-cultural adaptation of an instrument and, although I, personally, prefer the universalist approach proposed by Herdmann, Guillemin's is considered a sound methodology and has been utilized for the adaptation of different instruments for use in the Brazilian population. The applied methodology was well described and synthesized in Figure 1.

4. Also the authors clearly acknowledge the original version of the questionnaire and its respective author.

5. The study is clearly reported by the authors. However, to my point of view, some data is lacking.

Minor Essential Revisions:

6. Figure 1 is missing a heading.

Discretionary revisions

7. It seems to me that two other points should be mentioned, either in the background section, or in the discussion. In relation to the CPCHILD, I think that the manuscript would benefit from reports of studies that used the original questionnaire, thus reinforcing its contribution and relevance for the knowledge of quality of life of children with cerebral palsy.

8. The other point would be data on the magnitude of incidence or prevalence of cerebral palsy in Brazil, even if these came from small hospital-based studies or are only estimates based on data from other countries.

Major Compulsory Revisions
9. In relation to the results, the manuscript could benefit if the authors could extend a little more in their comments about the differences between A1 and A2 that generated discussion and the motives that led them to their final selections. This is also true for the modifications related to questions and items that were effected to create the synthesized version for the pre-test and also the final modifications made on the basis of that pre-test. This is particularly important since those readers who could not read in Portuguese would not be able to compare and analyze the final version of the instrument and its original English version and decide for themselves if these are comparable. Thus, the work would be enriched if more details were given on the points.

10. The authors state that their final version exhibited a satisfactory level of semantic equivalence but we were obligated to accept this for its face value, as no specific data is given, except for the characteristics of the sample of caregivers that participated in the pre-test. There is only one illustration (Figure 1) and it is related to the process of translation and cross-cultural adaptation. I would suggest one or two tables showing major discrepancies between translations (A1, A2; T1, T2) and versions (A12; pre-final version) defined in different stages, as well as the main points that required evaluation and modification after the pre-test.

**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.
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