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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. “Abstract, background”, “Background, paragraph 7”, and “Methods, paragraph 1”: Since French versions of both the RAS and the CM measurements were to be prepared, it seems psychometric properties of both the measurements should be mentioned in the background section of the abstract.

2. “Abstract, background”: Since “the interplay between recovery- and citizenship- oriented supportive employment and quality of life at work” has not been addressed in the paper, it seems that the paragraph needs to be changed.

3. “Abstract, methods”: What do the authors mean by “severe” mental illness?

4. “Background, paragraphs 3 and 7”: Considering what has been mentioned in the background, have the two measurements been “compared” in this paper? And what do the authors mean by “comparing” RAS and CM?

5. It should be considered that “restoration of functioning” which has been mentioned as a part of clinical-recovery model in “Background, paragraph 4” includes many aspects, for example social functions.

6. Methods, paragraph 1: Did “two” translators translate CM/ RAS separately and then two other translators translated each of the measurements backward?

7. Methods, paragraph 1: What about face validity of the two measurements?

8. Methods, paragraph 4: It has been mentioned that the participants “self-reported a diagnosis of schizophrenia …”. What were their diagnoses based on medical records?

9. Results, paragraph 1: Some items of the CM did not load significantly on one specific factor. How many items did not load significantly on one specific factor? And how can the finding be explained?

10. Results, paragraph 1: What about Cronbach’s alpha of CM?

11. It seems that the explanations mentioned in “Results, paragraph 3” and table 3 need clarification.

12. Discussion, paragraph 3: What do the authors mean by “a 47-item questionnaire”?

13. Discussion: What about comparing findings of the study and psychometric properties of other versions of the two measurements?

14. Limitations, paragraph 1: What do the authors mean by having an opinion to
share about the content of items?

15. Competing interests: What do the authors mean by “All other authors declare that …”?

Minor Essential Revisions:

1. “Background, paragraph 3”: Reference number 7, as it has been mentioned in the text, needs to be corrected.

2. Results, paragraph 2: It seems that the sum of mentioned items of short version of RAS subscales is 25 (instead of 24).
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Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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