Reviewer's report

Title: Field-testing of the Rapid Assessment of Disability Questionnaire

Version: 3  Date: 6 July 2014

Reviewer: Tsan-Hon Liou

Reviewer's report:

The authors used and reported the field-testing of the RAD questionnaire among adults (#18 years old) in Bangladesh and Fiji. The results show that self-assessment of functioning and well-being sections to be psychometrically robust. Access to the community section was useful to identify the differences in access to different services and participation in the community between people with and without disability. This is an important issue regarding the increasing prevalence of disability. A robust and quick assessment of disability based on the International Classification of Functioning, Health and Disability (ICF) is still lacking. This study provides a good sample of assessment.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. How did authors document a verbal informed consent?

2. The RAD questionnaire is interviewer administered. Who interviewed the participants and what training did they receive?

3. Page 6, the RAD questionnaire paragraph, “those who answered ‘yes’ to an item were then asked to rate the frequency of difficulty as ‘some of the time,’ ‘most of the time,’ or ‘all of the time.’ Those who self-reported having difficulty ‘most’ or ‘all of the time’ to at least one item from the first seven domains or at least two items from the psychological distress domain were considered to experience functional limitation (referred to as disability hereafter)”. Do authors have any reference?

4. Page 9, in Field-testing in Fiji paragraph, “Considering that there are no gold standard instruments to compare the RAD questionnaire, a convenience sample of known people with disability were recruited in Fiji to test the sensitivity and specificity”, cases were recruited from among those who were receiving services from community-based rehabilitation or were enrolled in Disabled People’s Organisations. Please describe clearly about the criteria of people with disability (case).

5. Page 6-7, the RAD questionnaire paragraph, “self-care” in section 2 and “taking care of one’s self” in section 4 are asking the same thing.

6. Page 12, participants paragraph, could authors explain why there was no significant difference between people with disability and their matched controls in the level of education in Bangladesh but significant in Fiji?

7. Although the rights awareness section (section 3) has been removed from the final version of the RAD, it is an important information to know the current status
of people with disability.

Minor Essential Revisions
1. Line 390, section 3 should be section 4.

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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