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We thank the reviewers for their insightful and helpful comments and for their commitment to the improvement of this manuscript.

Here are our responses:

Reviewer #1:

Why randomization? Is the group of 30 a random sample of the whole 185? Is the whole 185 a random sample of all patients presented during the study period? Randomization connotes with RCT; did you compare something with something else? Where is the control group?

The reviewer is correct to question the use of the term “randomized”, when what was meant was “random”. Changes are made to page 6, lines 119 and 122. No randomization occurred in this study.

Reviewer #2:

Major compulsory revisions:

1. In the methods section is now mentioned that the methods have been carried out in confirmation with the COSMIN checklist. However, it is necessary to report the items in the COSMIN checklist to be able to evaluate the methodological quality of the study. A lot of the items in the checklist are not reported in the methods section (e.g. number of missing items, how missing items were handled, predefined hypotheses regarding correlation with other instruments).

2. The Discussion section still lacks criticisms regarding the methods and results.

3. The study of Aslan et al. and Schellingerhout et al. have been added, but it would be more useful to compare the results to those found in these 2 studies in a separate paragraph. Now the comparison is somewhat scattered over the discussion section.

4. The motivation for not evaluating the responsiveness of the NDI is inappropriate in my opinion. It would be very useful to get more information about the responsiveness of the Turkish version of the NDI (see Schellingerhout et al.)

Minor compulsory revisions:

1. It is reported in the methods section that “Factor analysis was performed on the results of Groups 2”. It is unclear which part of the study population this refers to.
Responses:

1. We have added information in the Methods and Results on the issues raised by the reviewer regarding the items from the COSMIN process that were not included. These changes are on page 6: lines 115-116, page 8: lines 158-161, page 9: line 193-.

2. We have added a section on Limitations of the study: page 14, lines 283-291.

3. The study by Schellingerhout et al. was not actually mentioned in the Discussion. Rather, we preferred to cite the primary studies in each of the paragraphs pertaining to one or another of the issues addressed in our study.

   With regard to Aslan et al., we prefer to leave the sentences addressing this study which do appear in each of these paragraphs, as they focus on each of the separate issues raised in each of these paragraphs. However, we have also added a summary paragraph on the comparison between our study and that of Aslan et al. on page 14, lines 287-299

4. We have removed the statement on responsiveness (page 14, lines 300-302) and have addressed the lack of analysis of responsiveness in the section on Limitations.

Minor revision:

1. We have clarified this point on page 6, line 132.

We hope these revisions are satisfactory to the reviewers and, again, we thank them for their help in improving the quality of our manuscript.