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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The authors need to describe the translation process. Hopefully some type of back-translation technique was used (for example, Sperber AD: Translation and validation of study instruments for cross-cultural research. Gastroenterology 2004, 126: S124-S128.). If not, this might explain why the cronbach alphas were not as high, why some items were dropped, and why the factor structure was different. An inadequate translation process may render the remaining analyses uninformative.

2. Page 5, the authors need to report the total number of eligible subjects so a response rate can be calculated. The response rate will help readers determine the generalizability of the results. Further, it can be an indirect measure of other important characteristics of a survey – it’s face validity and how burdensome it is to complete.

3. The authors should also provide more detail about the survey administration process. Was it mailed to subjects or handed to them directly? If handed out, in what setting and by whom? Was there a second or third distribution of the survey? When and how did that happen?

4. The authors should have the data available to report other survey characteristics such as:
   a) Was there enough response variation per item? This could also be called item discrimination or floor / ceiling effects)?
   b) Was there response variation among clinical units, hospitals, and provider types?

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Consider reporting test-retest reliability, if data available.

2. Page 4, methods, first sentence, should say “was” instead of “has been”. There is a similar verb tense issue in the statistical analysis section.

3. Page 4, what is the difference between a teaching hospital and university hospital? I would think that a university hospital is also a teaching hospital.
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