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Reviewer's report:

The purpose of this study is to validate the Japanese version of the Questionnaire about the Process of Recovery. The authors have shown that the measure has a similar factor structure to the original scale, is reliable and has acceptable convergent validity. A major strength of this work is the amount of effort that was taken to translate the questionnaire into Japanese. I rarely come across an article with such extensive translation work put into it. Despite the strengths of the paper, some issues should be resolved before it is accepted for publication.

The biggest issue I have in this study concerns the sample. I noticed that their sample included people with mental illness as well as people with developmental disabilities, intellectual disabilities, epilepsy, an "other" category with 21 individuals, and a category of "not known". First, mental illness and developmental disability are two different things, even though people can experience both mental illness and developmental or intellectual disability simultaneously. One cannot recover from a developmental disability or intellectual impairment as one does a mental illness. I am not even sure what recovery from intellectual disability means. I would not consider epilepsy a mental illness on the same level as schizophrenia or mood disorders. The other category needs to be broken down. Which mental illnesses are in this category and are they true mental illnesses? And finally, if the authors did not known what mental illness a participant had, how did the authors know they could include them in the study? How did those with and without mental illness rate similarly or differently on the scale? Have the authors tested the factor structures of the scale with those with mental illness vs those with mental illness and developmental disability removed? Could this explain some of the poor factor loadings of the EFA? Could the authors conduct their analyses with those with mental illness alone for a more parsimonious study?

Could the authors provide some more detail about the study design if possible? As it stands, just mentioning that it was a cross sectional design seems like a sparse description for an entire section.

The test-retest computation was performed with a very small sample size (N=10). While I fully understand the difficulties in recruiting participants for test-retest assessments, this should at least be mentioned as a limitation in the discussion section, and the authors should mention that future validation studies of the Japanese version of the questionnaire should better assess the test-retest reliability of the measure. Also, the authors should provide a demographic breakdown of those who completed the test-retest assessment so the reader can see how these participants differed from the entire sample.
One major comment to address is that the authors should provide a better rationale for why they have conducted an exploratory factor analysis along with a confirmatory factor analysis. I suspect it was because they wanted to compare the original factor solution to one that would emerge from the data. However, this purpose (if it is indeed the purpose) is never fleshed out—and it should be.

Similarly, the authors should provide a rationale and justification for why they used a maximum likelihood estimation with a promax rotation relative to other options. The authors should also describe the method they used to justify their sample for the factor analyses.

Overall, the results are well described, but the authors must include tables showing how each item loaded onto 1) the CFA solution and 2) the EFA. That way a reader can see the factor loadings for each item, as well as how they differed between the CFA and EFA. Knowing this information is crucial for future researchers who will use the scale the authors have validated.

In the discussion section, the authors should describe how their solutions differed or were similar to the factor model of the original scales as well as make a stronger connection to studies of the factor structure of the questionnaire in other studies. They should also mention as a limitation the poor factor loadings found in the EFA.

Also, the first paragraph on page 11 of the discussion section sounds awkward, and the authors should revise the wording of the paragraph.
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