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Reviewer's report:

I) Major Compulsory Revisions

Background:
1- Page 6: “Inclusion and exclusion criteria” should be moved to the Methods section.
2- Page 6: Why did you select only the institutionalized patients? Was there any logic behind it or did you only intend to simplify sampling?
3- Page 6 line 13: In this part you have to define disability (both physical and intellectual disability) with references.
4- Page 6 line 16: How did you do this screening step? By which questionnaire? What do you mean assertive manner? How did you recognize this assertive manner?
5- Page 6 line 17: How and why did you categorize ID persons? What is the reference for categorization?
6- Page 6 line 17: Were these two tests performed on Mild ID persons who were screened in the last step? Or did you use the screening for mild ID subjects?

Methods:
The methods section should be rearranged because the process of your study is incomprehensible and unordered. Many important things were not mentioned in the manuscript. Please clarify:
1- What was your study design?
2- What was the area of the study?
3- How did you find your target group?
4- What was the sample size?
5- What was the sampling method? Did you have a randomized sampling method?
6- Who evaluated the disabilities?
7- Page 7 line 8: I can't understand. Did you use the WHOQOL-Dis and compare it with other topics from a qualitative study? If yes, please cite the reference. If there is not any published data, you have to describe the qualitative study.
8- Page 8 WHODAS II: This questionnaire measures disability. Did you use it for the screening or in the main study? Did you validate this questionnaire in this study? Did you use only Cronbach’s alpha to validate it? If you had validated it before this study, please mention the reference.

9- Page 9: You used two other questionnaires (satisfactory and Beck) in this study for convergent validity. You had to validate these two questionnaires before this study. Did you do it? I checked your references. Reference 20 is a paper about the main questionnaire and number 23 is a Portuguese paper which I could not check. In general, why did you choose only these two questionnaires?

10- Page 9 line 11: What do you mean “logistical reasons”? Please clarify your reasons.

11- Page 10: Did only you use two questions for measuring the construct validity?

Discussion:

As you showed in your results, the new components extracted from factor analysis were different from the three factors of the DISQOL module. Now what is your suggestion?

II) Minor Essential Revisions

Abstract:
The abstract should be shortened.

Result: It seems that this part is a conclusion and not the results.

Background:

1- Page 4 line 12: I think this frequency (nearly 22% of the population with disabilities) is too high. It is better to define disability first.

2- Page 5 line 1: The reference number should be moved to the end of phrase

3- Page 5 line 9: You did not define quality of life. In your explanation in this line it seems that quality of life is only an instrument to evaluate the psychological and medical status.

Methods:

1- Page 7 line 9: Who were these three judges?

2- Page 7 line 10: Do you mean you had translated the items extracted from your qualitative study into English?

3- Page 7 line 13: who were the two experts and how did you select them?

4- Page 7 line 14: In general, did you extract the new concepts from FGD and add them in the original questionnaire?

5- Page 7 paragraph 3: You have to move this paragraph after the explanation of WHO pilot study in line 7.

6- Page 8 line 12: “participants’ perceptions of their health status and disability” is not a demographic characteristic.
7- Page 8 line: The module has 12 items both in the WHO paper that you cited and in table 1 of your manuscript.

8- Page 9: At the end of this page you wrote “This protocol was the subject of extensive discussions between the investigators and the Hospital de Clínicas de Porto Alegre Research Ethics Committee”. So, what decision did you finally make?

9- Page 10 line 19: What were the independent samples?

10- How did you complete the questionnaires? Were there any differences between self- and interviewer-administered questionnaires?

Results:
1- Page 11 line 21: I think the question “Are you satisfied with how your environment is adapted to your limitation?” is an item for PD subjects not ID subjects.

2- Please write the important results from tables 7 to 10.

Discussion:
1- Page 13 line 20: Do you mean perception to be healthy and not healthy?

2- Page 13 line 22: I cannot understand. you did not mean being healthy in the questionnaire and you only asked the perception of the subjects. So, why do you think the PD subjects did not positively answer this question after a mild illness?

Conclusion:
1- Page 17 line 3: As you wrote in the methods, you have evaluated this questionnaire only for mild intellectually disabled subjects. Please remove the “moderate” intellectual impairment.

2- This study has not evaluated the validity and reliability of the questionnaire in a randomized sample group. Moreover, you found differences between your gathered factors (from factor analysis) and the three factors of DISQOL module. Meanwhile, you did not check test-retest reliability for physically disabled subjects. I think it is better to write a more cautious conclusion.

Tables and figure:
1- Figure 1: Are there any references for this figure or was it only your approach? If this was your approach, please clarify your reason about it in the methods section.

2- Figure 1: The answer to the question “Does this illness limit or restrict your social interactions with others (activity participation)?” may be yes not only in patients with disability but also in individuals with depression or some other mood disorders.

3- Tables 2 to 5: Please write the items of the module or explain the numbers of the items in table footnote.

4- Table 7: What do you mean “years of study”?
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