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Reviewer’s report:

Review of BMC Manuscript – Cross-cultural adaptation of the Neck Disability Index and the Copenhagen Neck Functional Disability Scale for patients with neck pain due to degenerative and discopathic disorders: a validation study of the Polish versions.

This study addresses an important issue of appropriately adapting existing questionnaires to be used across various cultural groups.

There is good description of the questionnaires. The methods for translation, cross-cultural adaptation and psychometric testing are also described in detail and appropriately followed according to Beaton et al 2000.

However, there are a number of areas in the Background where the sentence structure can be improved, and a point in the methods for psychometric testing that could be included. These are also listed under Minor essential revisions.

MINOR Essential Revisions

1. Page 3: “Pain in the cervical region of the spine is almost as common as back problems: annually about 30% of the population experiences neck pain (neck pain-NP), 14% of whom report complaints lasting longer than 6 months [2,13].
   a. Recommend to define type of back problems and provide reference or delete it altogether
   b. Recommend to change “experiences” to experience

2. Page 4: “A number of authors [3,5,8] highlight the need to adapt recognised and widely applied methods in research to indigenous conditions instead of developing a new scale leading to the multiplication of outcome measures lacking the comparison of populations [2].
   a. This sentence is setting up the rationale for you study. Currently it is awkward to read and requires revising for clarification.
   For example: By “methods” do you mean “assessment tools” ie. questionnaires? This should be revised for the reader.

3. Page 4: “The NDI is the scale most commonly applied, extensively tested and translated.”
4. Page 4: ‘The NDI was proved to be a valid and reliable instrument to measure disability related to neck pain [9,14,22].’

a. Recommend changing proved to proven
b. Please provide context for validation; ie which version and for what populations

5. Page 11: “15 (25%) of the patients participating in our study omitted the section concerned with driving (section 8).”

a. Change “15” to “fifteen”

6. Abstract: “60 patients treated due to degenerative and discopathic disorders in the cervical spine filled out the NDI-PL and the CDS-P”

a. Change “60” to “Sixty”

7. Lastly, with respect to the methods for psychometric testing, there are two areas that were not explored that are recommended by Beaton et al. and are very useful for research purposes. These could be discussed in the discussion under future research.

a. Responsiveness: Although this property could not be assessed due to the study design, it remains a useful property required for determining if the measures are sensitive to detect change over time. This should be noted, perhaps in future research.

b. Item-level analyses: This approach based on item-response theory such as Rasch and would be helpful in future research to provide a more detailed analysis of the functioning of the items for the population. Also recommend including in a section on future research.
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