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**Reviewer's report:**

The manuscript addresses the test-retest reliability of the instrument SCINEXA in a non-caucasian population which is a relevant topic for the audience of BMC dermatology journal. Although the manuscript provides interesting data, the statistical analysis and conclusions should be improved. Several other aspects needing revision before acceptance are listed below.

1. Please make a clear distinction throughout the manuscript between Reproducibility and reliability

2. Language revision is needed before acceptance. For example in page p 7, line 27 "then" should be replaced by " than"

3. It is not apprehensible for this reviewer the use of Anova test for ordinal data.

4. Please clarify the objective to test different proportions in the sample with Fisher test

5. Please report standard deviation in Table 3

6. Table 4 is not intelligible. Please modify the title and explain the results with more detail in the text. Why is there a markedly higher number of patients with a score lower than 2 at 4 days retest, in comparison with baseline?

7. The authors state that the SCINEXA this scale is useful for the population living in Ecuador. However, the authors only report the test-retest reliability and thus conclusions about the applicability of the scale for a given population are not supported

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Does the work include the necessary controls?  
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?  
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English  
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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