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**Reviewer's report:**

Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   The authors state that their objective was to describe the process of cross cultural adaption of the MUEQ to Brazilian Portuguese and verify the psychometric properties.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   The authors sampled office workers from one institution only. How would this relate to the generalizability to all the office workers in Brazil? Is it possible that tertiary institutions have well-designed and ergonomic work-stations and hence provide for less variability than we would expect with a broader population?

   241 of the original 627 participants did not respond to the study on confirmatory factor analysis. This, unfortunately is the weakest link of this study. The authors point to the earlier study by Eltayeb et al, which has a lower response rate of 44%, unfortunately two wrongs do not make it right.

   Do the authors have data on the demographics profile of those who did not respond? If not, perhaps even comparing the profile of the respondents with broad institution profile might alleviate this problem somewhat.

   As another way of justification, the authors point out that sample size is adequate. However, sample size may not necessarily fix the problem of representativeness and that statement should be removed.

   My basic concern is that only a subset of the original participants approached responded, and when they did, they took a relatively short time to answer the questionnaire. What is the correlation between the levels of agreement and consistency shown with time taken to fill the questionnaire?

Page 5: Usual to present standard deviation for age, instead of the CI. Also use 95% CI instead of CI 95%

Table 1. Need to explain what this prevalence means in the column header

Besides the age description of the subset of 55 individuals involved in the cross-cultural adaptation, can the authors present other demographics/computer usage to determine generalizability?
Is there any explanation why the participants took a shorter time to complete (15 mins) compared to 20mins as reported? Is there a possibility that the participants rushed through the questions?

For the pre-final version test, what is the profile of the 15 subjects as compared to the other groups (validation, etc)?

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes

4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation?
   Yes

5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes

6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes

7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Limitation of the poor response rate needs to be better discussed

8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   NA

9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Words that describe methodology like confirmatory factor analysis should be avoided in the title

10. Is the writing acceptable?
    No. The article will benefit from English language editing. Lots of spelling errors e.g. see page 7, last para the “complaint section”, dutch in page 8, etc

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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