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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (Brief or other article types: is there a clear objective?)

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with sufficient technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Yes - current version is technically sound
GENERAL COMMENTS: The manuscript "THE ITALIAN VERSION OF THE CRANIOFACIAL PAIN AND DISABILITY INVENTORY IN PATIENTS WITH CHRONIC TEMPOROMANDIBULAR JOINT DISORDERS. Cross-cultural adaptation, reliability and validity" aims "to develop an Italian form of the Craniofacial Pain Disability Inventory (CFPDI-I) and investigate its clinimetric abilities in patients with temporomandibular disorders (TMD) the CFPDI was translated following international standards."

To develop an Italian version for the CFPDI is relevant and new. The authors have adequately responded to previous reviewers. This is a solid paper.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

I have only two minor comments.

The authors want to investigate "clinimetric abilities." I found this reference in the internet 'Clinimetrics' is the term introduced by Alvan R. Feinstein in the early 1980s to indicate a domain concerned with indexes, rating scales and other expressions that are used to describe or measure symptoms, physical signs and other clinical phenomena" (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22171900). I'm not sure this applies here. Therefore, to avoid confusion, I would recommend omitting the term. Investigating "the instrument's psychometric properties" sounds fine to me.

The authors concluded "The cross-culturally adapted version of Craniofacial Pain and Disability Inventory (CFPDI-I) showed satisfactory psychometric properties that replicate those of the original version and, therefore, can be implemented in the clinical assessment of Italian people affected by TMD."

Here, I'm happy to see that psychometric properties are mentioned (see previous comment). However, I'm wondering whether the scale in only applicable to TMD patients. If this would be the case, the applicability of the scale would be rather limited. Instead, are the TMD patients not seen as a sample of patients suffering from craniofacial pain and disability in general and therefore, findings are likely generalizable to patients with other craniofacial pains such as burning mouth? I would not see a problem if the authors would recommend use of the scale for craniofacial pain in general. Maybe a short paragraph, added to the discussion, can inform the reader how the authors see the generalizability of their instrument.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

I have two suggestions. I guess the authors can be trusted to make these changes (or not).
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 am able to assess the statistics

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

Acceptable
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