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Reviewer’s report:

General comments

I have read the answers by the authors, and they have given explanations for the issues I raised. Secondly, almost all of my concerns/suggestions have been followed and the manuscript changed accordingly. However, it was rather difficult to track the changes as not all of them were highlighted in yellow. Lastly, I still recommend the manuscript to be proof-read by a native English speaking person as several of the sentences need typing or grammatical correction.

Major compulsory revisions

Page 6: “The Work Environment domain was excluded from the Brazilian Portuguese of the MUEQ according to confirmatory factor analysis.”.
I recommend that this is reported only in the results section and not in the section on describing the original MUEQ. Second, when a domain is removed from the MUEQ-Br, the total sum score is not comparable to the original version, and this needs to be acknowledged.

Page 7: “The total sum of the questionnaire is 156 points. Greater the sumscore, greater the perception of the worker about the interference of psychosocial and ergonomics aspects on work context.”.
What is the rationale behind summing different dimensions when most textbooks on this advice against it? (e.g. [1, 2]). The problem is if one dimension goes up and another goes down, the total score stays the same.

Page 8: The incomprehension index. I am curious why the authors believe that if up to 1/5 of the respondents do not understand the question this is OK? To me it would pose a serious problem if say 15% of my target population did not understand a particular question. Please provide references on the incomprehension index and the cut-off of 20%.

Page 9: It says: “On Cross-cultural studies the better solution is the use of Confirmatory Factor Analysis.”
Confirmatory FA is used if the dimensional structure of the questionnaire is known either from previous research or from a conceptual model, not when the questionnaire is cross-culturally adapted.
Page 12: “the Item-Total Correlation of each domain was between 0.28 and 0.73, inside the range recommended as acceptable (0.2 – 0.8) [27]."


To the best of my knowledge, this reference does not talk about item-total correlations. Please use a proper reference.

Page 10 and 13: CFA and omission of the “The Work Environment domain”

It is difficult to follow why the two initial models (7 and 6 factors) were included in the CFA other than the fact that they are reported in the literature. However, are these two models based on a conceptual model or purely driven by statistical findings (e.g. EFA)? Why should we choose one model over the other? Please be a bit more specific as to your choices when testing using CFA.

Second, the authors choose to omit the “Work Environment domain” and then further reduce the MUEQ by omitting nine questions (15% reduction in items). This totally changes the questionnaire compared to the original version, and I therefore believe it is a different instrument which needs to be addressed in the paper.
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