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Reviewer's report:

I think the manuscript has improved a lot, so you've done a good job with the revision.

I have the following questions and comments at this stage:

- Page 9, second paragraph: Suggest to use "Questionnaire" as a sub-heading.

- Page 9, line 39: You write: "Thus, the PPE-15 has a minimum score of 0 (no problems) and a maximum score of 15". For me, this seems confusing. Why didn't you include the total score ranged from 0-15 in the analysis? Both the test-retest analysis and correlation analysis would benefit from including a total score. The latter could also be correlated with the total score of the Norpeq.

- Page 9, line 41: You write: "In this model, non-response was counted as a non-problem". This is in contrast with what you write on page 11 (first paragraph): "...missing items were not included in the analysis". Please explain.

- Page 11, first paragraph, first sentence: "Because the data were not normally distributed..." - which data?

- Page 12, paragraph about binomial linear mixed model: this part is difficult to follow. What is the dependent variable(s)? Did you conduct 15 models (for each PPE-15 item) or do you use the total score? Please clarify the ICC in this context, this usually is the variation on level 2 (given 2 Levels) divided by the total variation (thus representing an estimate of the cluster effect). If this has the same meaning as your ICC - why do you report the mixed model at all? This is only relevant if the cluster effect has some magnitude, with effects on standard errors and statistical tests at level 1 (but this is not the case in your study). Furthermore, I am unsure if n=5 is enough for mixed models. I should say that I am not familiar with the binomial linear mixed model, so maybe I have misunderstood.

- Page 13, table 1 - is EQ5D3L the same as self-rated health in table 5? Please use the same terms across tables.
- Page 14: Table 3 shows that the Kappa for PPE-11 is 0.125, and should be rounded up to 0.13 in the text above (not 0.12).

- Page 19, line 36: you refer to reference 54, but should refer to reference 55 (Crow).

- Page 20, line 44-46: "Indicating a potential selection bias" - incomplete sentence.

- Table 2: why are some correlations positive and other negative? For instance, -0.45 for NORPEQ1/PPE-1 and 0.39 for NORPEQ1/PPE-1. Please explain, maybe include a footnote.
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