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Reviewer's report:

General
This is a very interesting review article and provides important suggestions for researchers in non-English speaking countries. However, the following issues should be addressed.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1) The authors showed the validation status of each questionnaire; however, for several questionnaires, it remains unclear whether they are valid in Pakistan or whether further validation studies are needed. Some studies employ “psychiatrists’ clinical diagnoses” as a gold standard. Moreover, some studies do not report reliability values, such as internal consistency. Furthermore, the sample size is very small in some studies. The authors should clearly state the above-mentioned problems regarding the validation status of the questionnaires.

2) On page 5, the authors showed that technical validity is one of the main domains of cross-cultural validity. Did each study examine the technical validity of the translated questionnaires?

3) On page 21 (Table 3), the cutoff score for AKUADS are 19/20 in the upper two studies, but 31.5 in the bottom study. I’m unfamiliar with this questionnaire, but are both scores correct?

4) On page 22 (Table 3), the Positive Predictive Value column for BSI-44 (reference number 42) is blank.

5) On page 24 (Table 3), the Positive Predictive Value column for SDQ is blank. The authors should recheck the tables, as the values in the tables are very important for this review.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

6) On page 4, the authors state that they had considered writing this kind of review before the 2005 earthquake. It would be nice to know how they originally identified the need for such research. Such a description would further highlight the importance of this study.

What next?: Accept after minor essential 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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