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Reviewer's report:

The question posed by the authors is well defined and the data are sound. The description of methods and results seems appropriate, but some important information is missing to evaluate the robustness of the results. I advice to adhere to the COSMIN-checklist (www.cosmin.nl) for nomenclature of the different clinimetric properties and for items that should be mentioned in the Methods- and Results-section.

One of the most important aspects of translating a health measurement instrument is cross-cultural validation by means of confirmatory factor analysis or differential item function. This is missing in this study, as well as in previous translations of the NDI (see: Schellingerhout JM, Heymans MW, Verhagen AP, de Vet HC, Koes BW, Terwee CB. Measurement properties of translated versions of neck-specific questionnaires: a systematic review. BMC Med Res Methodol 2011;11:87). This makes it hard to say whether the translated instrument indeed measures what it is supposed to measure and, for instance, if the results for internal consistency are accurate. I advice to add a paragraph on structural validity of the translated version of the NDI.

The discussion is mainly a positive confirmation of thei results and lacks a critical appraisal of the methods and results. The most important shortcoming of the discussion is not mentioning the study of Aslan et al. (Aslan E, Karaduman A, Yakut Y, Aras B, Simsek IE, Yagly N. The cultural adaptation, reliability and validity of neck disability index in patients with neck pain: a Turkish version study. Spine 2008;33:E362-365.), which is a previous study on the clinimetric properties of a translated Turkish version of the NDI. The authors should compare their results and methods to this study.

The conclusions are well balanced and adequately supported by the data. A small and disputable adjustment would be removal of references 8-14, because the different languages for which translations of the NDI are available is already mentioned in reference 7.

The title and abstract accurately convey what has been found, except for the fact that the results for internal consistency are not mentioned in the abstract.

The manuscript is not written by a native English speaker and it shows. It would be useful to let a native English speaker review the manuscript for grammar and spelling.
In summary, this manuscript is a useful addition to scientific knowledge. However, some major revisions need to be carried out, before it is acceptable for publication.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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