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Reviewer's report:

A study to validate the Persian version of the SQOL-F. Good to see the rigour with which the translation was carried out.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Have someone re-read the manuscript for grammatical accuracy and for mistakes e.g. missing words. First sentence of the Background should have 'his or her' referring to reproductive life, especially since this about women's quality of life.

2. CVI and CVR need references and further explanation. I am not familiar with these assessments. The statement 'scores equal or greater than 1.5 were considered acceptable' requires a reference and is this relating to CVI/CVR above or some other assessment method?

3. You cannot use the Ratcliffe et al publication to support your subscales because they simply took one or two items to cover the 3 concepts that were implicitly built into the measure by the original developers - confidence, emotional impact and sexual relationship. Ratcliffe et al did not 'identify' them.

4. Table 4, do not reproduce the items - summarise each item e.g. 'When I think about my sexual life, I feel frustrated' change to 'Frustrated' - to simplify the table and also because you would need to get permission from the original developer to reproduce.

5. Discussion - need to discuss the domains you found more fully and why they are different from those built into the measure by the original developers i.e. confidence, emotional impact, relationships - are yours similar? If not, why do you think this is the case?

Minor Essential Revisions

1. I would argue that the interviews conducted with patients to assess face validity is actually an assessment of content validity. Indeed, these are the most important assessors of content validity more so than the health care professionals.

2. Report the Exploratory Factor Analysis results first because then the results for the sub-domains make sense since the original measure is only a total score and does not have sub-domains.

3. For ICC results, also state the sub-domains results e.g. 'and for the sub-scales, ICC ranged from 0.50-0.88' - good to excellent.
4. Not sure why you have the paragraph about the original SQOL-F’s validity seems out of place and more an introduction paragraph...a major limitation of your research is that you have not tested convergent or known-groups validity - perhaps you should move this paragraph to the limitations section and state something like '...although assessing these psychometric properties were not assessed, the original validation study showed the SQOL-F to have strong convergent and known-groups validity and we would expect the same for the Persian version, especially given the solid results given above...' or something like this?

5. Results section - Study Sample - ‘...reason for refusal was dislike’ - please elaborate, what do you mean by this? They didn’t like the idea of reporting about their sexual life?

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

**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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