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Reviewer's report:

The study by Ouyang et. al. presents validation of the Narcolepsy severity scale, which is published in English and French versions. The process was divided into three steps and after two former the translation was adapted accordingly. The validation in population of patients suffering from narcolepsy was further divided into two groups by presence of specific anti-narcoleptic treatment. The results show favorable consistency parameters, broad distribution of the scale scores in the tested population and also correlation to the treatment status. Further correlations were found with other scales and sleep parameters, but these can be biased by use of similar questions. The validation population consisted of both adult and pediatric patients.

The study is scientifically rigorously performed and presents very useful information, which can serve as a solid background proof for further use of the Chinese version Narcolepsy severity scale in clinical trials.

Regarding the text, I have only minor remarks.

1) The text requires proof reading regarding the English grammar, there are probably missing words and wrong use past tense.

2) The part presenting the ROC analysis regarding the treatment status may be somewhat misleading - the test for sensitivity whether the patient is treated or not, is not the aim of the study, it is more important to stress the broad spectrum of scale scores in those subgroups, and provide information substantial for future planning of clinical trials (the data for future power analysis)

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Yes

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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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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