Reviewer's report

Title: Translation and Validation of the Arab Version of the Late-Life Function and Disability Instrument: A Cross Sectional Study

Version: 1 Date: 13 November 2014

Reviewer: Marla Beauchamp

Reviewer's report:

This study evaluated the validity and test-retest reliability of the Arabic version of the Late-Life Function and Disability Instrument (LLFDI) in 61 healthy older adults living in Israel. The authors report strong evidence in support of the translated measure’s psychometric properties and the methods are generally well described, however the manuscript would benefit from revision to increase readability. In particular, the description of the different scales of the LLFDI is confusing throughout the manuscript and the conclusion regarding sensitivity to change should be modified given the study design. My specific comments are below:

Major comments

1. In the abstract results are presented for known-groups validity with respect to falls and gender, however these analyses are not mentioned in the methods.
2. The conclusion in the abstract states that “the translated instrument is sensitive to both single and group changes”, however the study was cross-sectional and there are no results to support this statement.
3. In describing the scales it would be best to use the same nomenclature as the developers- i.e., instead of subcategories (line 101) use the term “dimensions” here and “role subscales” on line 103. This should be modified throughout the manuscript.
4. Please describe the study recruitment process in more detail. Where were subjects recruited from?
5. Page 10- absolute reliability. Please provide the formulas used to calculate the SEM and SRD. Please check if references 29 and 30 are the best references for describing the SEM and SRD and their uses.
6. Page 11. The results are somewhat difficult to follow- please be explicit when describing the results by referring to which component, dimension and subscale is being described. It might be helpful to add subheadings for the Function and Disability components separately.
7. On line 221 it states “there was no gender related differences”, then on lines 222 gender differences are discussed. Please clarify. Also please see my comment above about describing the scales explicitly and using the nomenclature as per the original instrument.
8. Line 255-256. Please modify this sentence. Given that this was a
cross-sectional study it is not possible to make any conclusions on sensitivity to change. The SEM and SRD provide evidence for the absolute reliability of the measure and can be useful for interpreting change scores in longitudinal investigations in future work.

9. Line 269. There is discussion that the LLFDI showed higher correlations with the performance-based measures than with the self-report measures and while this is interesting, might this also have to do with the underlying constructs being measured?

Minor comments

1. The introduction focuses on the Function component of the LLFDI without any explanation of the Disability component despite the article’s focus on both questionnaires.
2. Page 5, line 76. The wording “functional limitation component” may be confusing since the disability component contains a limitation scale. Suggest re-wording this here and throughout the manuscript to avoid confusion.
3. Page 6, lines 99-100. The description of the likert scale as ranging from “none” to “cannot do” is unclear- suggest including each of the response options.
4. What does the inclusion criterion “well-motivated” refer to?
5. Line 173. How were falls ascertained?
6. Line 224. The terms “frequency and capability of participating in life tasks” will likely be confusing to readers if the scales are not referred to. Do the authors mean the frequency and limitation dimensions of the Disability component of the LLFDI?
7. Line 228. Similar to above, what is meant by “the fallers demonstrated higher function and ability”? Do the authors mean higher scores on both the Function and Disability components?
8. Line 259. Is “ICC” the correct term here or is this a typo?
9. Line 270- minor misspelling of author name.
10. Lines 277 and 282. Similar comment as above, the term “higher function and ability” is not clear- which scales are being referred to here?
11. Perhaps I missed it, but will the translated version be made available as an appendix?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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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