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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. Abstract: Results: Results of agreement (SEM) statistics is missing

2. Page 3 Methods: A discription of the other instruments (RAND 36 and the Constant Score) with references is missing, and should have been placed here. There is no information about the measurement properties of the WORC (original and other language versions) or the other instruments, which should have been given in this section.


4. Page 5: Reliability:
   A) Define/explain what reliability, test-retest reliability, and agreement is.
   B) What is the acceptable threshold for ICC? Remember references.
   C) Give information about how the SEM was obtained (formula), as the values is likely to differ according to the method used. The information is important for others to be able to compare results and to understand the strength of the findings (influence of potential errors).

5) Page 5: Validity:
   A) Explain/define validity and the different aspects of it in relevance to your study.
   B) See the recommandation from the COSMIN group by Mokkink et al. 2010 considering the reporting of measurement properties of health related quality of life instruments. Analysis of correlation with other instruments is not a sufficient proof of validity in 2013.

6) Page 5: What was the limit (%) for the floor and ceiling effects?

7) Page 5: Where is the statistical chapter explaining the analysis in details?

8) Methods: Power calculations prior to the study or references to recommendations for power (in this type of studies) is lacking.

9) Page 6: Results. Far too much details about the translation process.

10) Page 8: What is the limit for correlations (ranged) + (references)?
11) The discussion should be re-written. Start with the findings. The presentation of MAP Institute does not belong here. Discuss the findings more critically. What are the strengths and the limitations in this study? How may they have an influence on your results and conclusions. Where there any important methodological limitations present in the studies you compared your results with?

12. Page 9: Conclusion. Should be re-written. In the first sentence, a result (no floor and ceiling effects) is given, and does not belong here. The validity is not evaluated according to recommendations in the recent methodological literature.

Minor Essential Revisions
1. Background: Last sentence in the first passage may be misleading. You have stated that quality of life measurement tool specifically suitable to investigate patients after rotator cuff repair are lacking, but WORC is available and found to suitable by others.

2. Page 3 Purpose of the study: Agreement should be mentioned.


4. Page 8 and 9: Discussion: The first sentence; See remarks made above (1).

Discretionary Revisions
1. Background: Second passage; Consider to use evaluator bias instead of surgeon bias.

2. Page 3 Background; Consider to use the more common name Oxford Shoulder Score(s), and to include the Oxford Instability Shoulder Score (also named Shoulder Instability Questionnaire)

3. Page 3 line 8 and 9 "We choose to translate and validate the WORC, as it was developed by and for people with rotator cuff disease..." Consider to drop "by" as it was not developed by the patients...
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