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Reviewer's report:

• Discretionary Revisions

The authors are not consistent in using the term CRPS 1. Because the inclusion criterion of CRPS is type 1 and not type 2, I assume that they have not the intention to use and validate the RASQ for use in patients with CRPS type 2.

• Minor Essential Revisions

The authors study the construct validity by means of studying the correlation with an other test/questionnaire which is supposed to correlate with the questionnaire under study. In literature this is called concurrent validity. I recommend to use this term.

The authors validate the three questionnaires by means of comparison with the VAS pain and VAS ADL. Unfortunately they don’t use an ambulation scale to compare with. It is known from literature that the correlation between pain and activity level (construct as measured in the questionnaires under study) is low. As far as I know the VAS ADL is not studied for validity and reliability. I miss these two weak points in the discussion, section limitation (see for example: Boonstra AM et al, Reliability and validity of the visual analogue scale for disability in patients with chronic musculoskeletal pain.Int J Rehabil Res. 2008 Jun;31(2):165-9).

On page 9, sentence 7: ‘However, the correlation of the total score etc…: because the construct measured in the VAS pain is farther away from the construct measured in the questionnaires under study than the VAS ADL, it is not ‘however’, but expected.

In the section discussion, section limitation, I miss the point that other psychometric qualities are not studied and need further investigation in future.

The three questionnaires have not the intention to measure pain nor ADL, but to measure specific activities. The VAS pain and VAS ADL are only used to study concurrent validity. The conclusion therefore is wrong.

Reference number 14 misses a part of the text.

Table 1:
Why a * after CRPS?
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