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**Reviewer's report:**

Major Compulsory Revisions

I think that the inclusion of a substantial group of normal people must have biased the assessment of validity and reliability. Most of the normal people scored a very low or non-existent LE score, whereas the LE patients had much higher scores. The Altman-Bland plot in of repeated PRTEE-D measurements shows highly consistent normal scores, followed by more variable LE scores. Additionally, many of the LE scores fall outside of the limits of agreement. I would like to see how the LE and normal groups performed separately. Perhaps different symbols on the Altman-Bland plot could be used. I would also like the authors to state how reliable the PRTEE-D is for LE patients only.

Minor Essential Revisions

In the Introduction, please state clearly whether the PRTEE questionnaire is designed to screen for LE or assess the severity of LE. The manuscript implies that PRTEE is designed to assess severity. Please confirm this.

Please briefly give more details of the ethical approval and informed consent process.

During the one week reliability assessment, do we know if the patients’ LE severity changed? For example, did some people feel that they were having a ‘bad day’? The reliability data are based upon the assumption that the condition is consistent across the 1-week time-span. Are there any data to support this?

Was this study a community-based or hospital-based study? How were the LE patients recruited? Are they a representative samples?

Make sure that Methods and Results are written in the past tense.

Discretionary Revisions

Propose a strategy about how to score people who avoid performing tasks with their affected arm. Should they be given a maximum score for that item, or is it more appropriate to leave the value missing?

Critically compare the methodology between this study and those that established PRTEE questionnaires in other languages.

Discuss why question 4 on the PRTEE-D pain subscale showed much less reliability than all of the other questions?
Level of interest: An article of limited interest

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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