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General comments
This is a well-written article, addressing the difficulty of measuring vertigo and dizziness in a construct way.

The question posed is well defined.
Methods are appropriate and well described.
The data are sound.
Reporting of data needs a minor revision.
Discussion needs a revision.
The limitations of the study are clearly stated.
The authors clearly acknowledge work from other authors which they are building on.
The title and abstract conveys accurately what has been found.
The writing is acceptable.

I think the article is suitable for publication, with a minor revision. My main concern is how data is displayed in results and discussion. I minor concern is the lack of paginating. Please find my comments below.

Abstract
In methods, the authors claim that patients filled in diverse questionnaires. It is better to write the exact number. Minor Essential Revisions

Background
I am a little confused about the last two sentences on page 3 (If the analysis....) Here it seems like the authors is discussing future research and this would be more appropriate in the discussion. Major Compulsory Revisions

Aim
To investigate all factor analysis studies – better to write which studies you mean (the French, the German……) Minor Essential Revisions

The last sentence in the aim: last instead of least? Minor Essential Revisions

Methods

First sentence: Perhaps better like this? “Patients who had suffered from vertigo, dizziness or unsteadiness, associated with vestibular disorder, for at least one month were included in the study”. Discretionary Revisions

Procedures

Please write the entire time-period, so the readers won't have to go back in the text. Minor Essential Revisions

Results

The reference to table 3 comes after the reference to table 4 in the text. Minor Essential Revisions

Table 1: Range for physical subscale on DHI goes from 0 to 29 but the highest possible value is 28. Minor Essential Revisions

Figure 1: Legend to figure is missing. Minor Essential Revisions

Discussion

The first sentence is not necessary; you only describe the method again, instead of describing main findings. Better “This study showed that the 3-factor solution seemed…….” Major Compulsory Revisions

The last paragraph on page 11: This analysis was not in your aim. I suggest you reformulate and put the findings of other research in connection with your own study.

First three paragraphs on page 12: It seems that you display knew data here and that these data answer the last question in the aim (to investigate the different results of all factor analysis studies). These paragraphs should be moved to results, or reformulated as suggested above. Major Compulsory Revisions

References

Please state the date of citation to web-page in reference 4. Minor Essential Revisions

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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