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Reviewer's report:

This methodological study is well defined and for most parts clearly described in the manuscript.

My comments on areas to clarify are listed below:

1. While I understand that this was a study using subjects from 10 randomized controlled trials on chronic non-specific neck pain, was a power analysis performed? How was the number of 558 arrived at? If no power analysis was performed, how do these numbers compare to other related studies?

2. The use of the Cronbach's alpha and split-half reliability assays is a norm for this type of validity determination. However, why was intra-class correlation (ICC) not used to indicate acceptable agreement between the measures? What was the reason for use of the exploratory factor analysis? Is it better? Were the requirements for this type of factor analysis met?

3. Please add to the discussion how their findings compare to related or similar studies, such as: 1) Soklic M, Peterson C, Humphreys BK. Translation and validation of the German version of the Bournemouth Questionnaire for Neck Pain. Chiropr Man Therap. 2012 Jan 25;20(1):2.; 2) Jaap Swanenburg, Kim Humphreys, Anke Langenfeld, Florian Brunner, Brigitte Wirth. Validity and reliability of a German version of the Neck Disability Index (NDI-G) Manual Therapy, Volume 19, Issue 1, February 2014, Pages 52-58; and 3) Gabel CP, Cuesta-Vargas A, Osborne JW, Melloh M. commentary on Swanenburg’s paper.
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