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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this report exploring the relationship between human rights and assistive technology use in Bangladesh. The researchers used the CRPD as an impetus to examine whether users of assistive technology were more likely to report enjoyment of human rights that non-users. Identifying and operationalizing human rights as an outcome of assistive technology use is a particularly noteworthy and an innovative aspect of this study. Despite the study limitations clearly outlined by the authors, the findings provide important information that supports the value and use of AT for individuals with disabilities in Bangladesh.

Minor essential revisions:

1. Reasonably, the authors created the questionnaire used in this study as there were none available. Ideally, they would have conducted some further testing on the reliability of the measure. Are internal consistency scores available for the other scales? Was test-retest reliability examined? To allow others to use the questionnaire in the future and to conduct that necessary testing, the authors should either include the full questionnaire in an appendix, or let the reader know where they are able to access this questionnaire.

2. Provide information on sample size calculation.

3. Please clarify the “non-users of wheelchairs”. The authors describe them as matched with someone with the same impairment, however it is unclear whether they lacked any means of mobility, or whether they used an alternative to a wheelchair. Perhaps this may account for some of the wheelchair use/non-use findings?

4. Please clarify the 2nd and 3rd to last sentences in the introduction. It is unclear what evidence-based strategies the authors are referring to, and how the next sentence links to the previous one.

5. In describing the outcome variable 'standard of living', the authors indicate that three items were used, while in Table 1, it appears that there were four items.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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