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Reviewer's report:

I thank authors for revising the manuscript. I believe the manuscript still needs work to look good before publication.

1- The design is "cross sectional and prospective cohort design" regarding two stages of the study. First stage used a cross sectional design and the second part of the study that evaluated the test-retest reliability followed a prospective cohort design.

2-The ICC, two-way random effects model, absolute measure, single rater should be used. I would suggest calculating the SEM and the SDC for absolute reliability measure (Terwee et al, 2007).

3-Results on the exploratory factor analysis should report the amount of variation explained by each of the factor and total variations explained by all the factors. Factors 2 and 5 are weak factors; if authors accept them as independent factors, the Discussion should include an explanation about it.

4- Authors confirmed the two-factor solution for the original English version. Authors need to discuss about their findings on the five-factor solution for the Japanese version against the English version regarding the results of factor analyses.

4-Table 3, median (IQR) should be reported for ordinal level measures.

5- Table 6, percent variation explained by each factor and total variance accounted for by factors should be added in the table.

6-Discussion should be expanded to explain the results obtained for each of the metrics assessed adequately, and to describe and compare the results on the SEM and SDC.
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