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Reviewer’s report:

Congratulation for doing an interesting study on the viable area of instruments validation

The following comments are suggested

Introduction: please update the literature reviews in the introduction section. Please add some justification on why a tool should be adopted into another language.

Methods section:

the method used for translation and cultural adaptation must be referenced. The title of "measurement" should be changed to "study instruments" in this regards for all presented instrument the data regarding their validity and reliability, also it is not clear why two form of QoL questionnaires were used (RAND and WHO?!)?

It should be declare which types of validity have been evaluated, I see only construct validity by CFA, although you did not say about the type of validity as construct validity, you should first do exploratory factor analysis then CFA, some important form of validity such criterion and discriminant validity are missed in this study, some form of items validity such item discriminant validity, item-scale correlation ... have not been evaluated, Type of ICC used must be reported. SEM and SDC must be calculated and reported.

? The Cronbach alpha also should be evaluated for each extracted domains. Discriminant validity could be assessed internally based on subgroups of the patients. It would also add ceiling and floor effects.

Other important point: this sentence at first paragraph of statistical analysis does not make sense "Item means, standard deviations,..." also I am not really agree with the presented sentence regarding cut points from previous study "Hadjistavropoulos", during a validation and adaptation it is possible to obtain new ones!!

this sentence "Non-parametric tests were used for ordinal variables and parametric tests for continuous variables." is not applicable i do not see the relevant results except Spearman rank and Pearson correlation coefficients! also I do not find any application for this sentence in results section?!! "and groups were compared with linear regression and analysis of variance."!! I see
three types of validity "content validity, criterion validity and construct validity. Criterion validity" in page 13 but in next page convergent validity also could be seen; please deal with the ambiguity. the proposed statistical test in this sentence "The association between HCCQ and gender was .... using Pearson correlation" are not correct, first it not clear why these evaluation were conducted?

then for the first you should use independent t-test and for the next one Pearson correlation should be used.

The title "Hypotheses" and the matters under it is not common in validation studies particularly the heading!majority of the matter does not make sense, for example the last sentence under heading "Hypotheses"

if continuous variables have been reported as mean(SD) how about the categorical variable?

I strongly recommend to see published papers regarding the validation of instrument in refereed good international journals for getting guidance on how to complete some other required analyses and preparing the methods section and results based on

Results

Changes made based on suggested comments during the process must be reported; I did not find any matter about the content and face validity!

Discussion

In first or second para must report the main findings.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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