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Reviewer's report:

Moamary and colleague report about translation and validation of the Arabic Version of the Self-Administered Standardised CRQ. The paper is well written and it will be of great value to have the CRQ available for Arabic speaking COPD patients. The comments, all minor but essential, below may help to further improve the paper:

Minor Essential Revisions

- Abstract: Please make clear where the (Pearson or Spearman rank) correlation coefficient was used and where the intraclass correlation coefficient. Otherwise, readers may think that the (Pearson or Spearman rank) correlation coefficient was used to assess test retest reliability.

- Abstract: it is unclear what they authors mean by acceptable and efficient. What are the data supporting this? It might be better to refer to reliability and validity rather than introducing ambiguous terms.

- Methods: It is stated that “Generally, these two translators had no difficulties during their translation”. What does in general mean? It would be interesting to learn about the challenges so that other people could benefit from the translation experience.

- The test retest period chosen is quite long and some patients may have changed. Is there any evidence available that patients were stable during that time?

- Validity was assessed by looking at correlations with other variables, this part would be substantially stronger if the authors had had some a priori beliefs in the correlations to be expected. Such a priori beliefs outline how an instrument is expected to correlate with other measures if it measures what it is supposed to measure. The observed correlations then show how close they are to the expected correlations. Thus if there were a priori beliefs in the correlations please report them and how they agree with the observed correlations.

- Results: since the range of patients determines the correlation coefficients a lot it would be important to know how broad the sample was. Therefore, I suggest adding the range for each continuous variable to the description of patients and to Table 1 (CRQ).

- Discussion: I do not think that it is a limitation that no gold standard test to assess HRQL exists. This is inherent to HQLO instruments and nothing can be
done about this. Also, I think the authors did assess validity even if they were somewhat limited because other validation instruments are not available in the Arabic language.

- Conclusion: Again, it is unclear how the data support the conclusion that the administration of the CRQ was acceptable and efficient.
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