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Reviewer's report:

"PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (Brief or other article types: is there a clear objective?)

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with sufficient technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

N/A - no experiments or analyses

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

Not sure - I am not able to assess the statistics in this study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are minor issues
OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: * Most of instances, I would say YES.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Statistics: I would suggest conducting preliminary statistics to report, at least, how the questionnaire performs.

Interpretation: the interpretation of preliminary results must rely, at minimum, on the quantitative data. Otherwise, all discussion can be viewed as a mere authors' opinion. This is not reproducible.

The format of this article is unusual, it is not structured as a traditional IMRD as it is intended to report the development of a new questionnaire to be adopted in a large epidemiological survey. Also, this is not a true validation psychometric study to report indicators of questionnaire performance.

* Yes, authors have made substantial changes to reflect my previous concerns.

* Although this manuscript has greatly improved in substance and presentation, mindful editor who is sensitive to methodological issues of survey would be interested in disseminating this paper.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

Academic editors like inclusive and reader-friendly texts. First point to consider is the right journal, otherwise it would be hard to place this manuscript in a good impact journal. One attempt, authors could consult the editor about his interest on this type of article."
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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