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Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors,

This is an interesting paper covering the translation and psychometric property testing of the Manchester Foot Pain and Disability Index (MFPDI) into simplified Chinese (C-MFPDI). Overall, I feel that the article is clearly written and describes appropriate methods, analysis, and conclusions. I have a few comments:

* Page 4: The introduction details a clear background of the MFPDI including what it aims to measure, its validation, translation, and its use to date. It also describes the need for the current article.
* Page 5, line 10: Typo? Should this read "evaluated in two stages"?
* Page 5, line 42: I could not find Figure 1 (translation protocol). Although the transcription process is clearly described, a figure would be valuable for the reader.
* Page 8, line 53: Internal consistency for the total scale is reported. I feel it would also be valuable to add the range of Cronbach's alpha for the subscales here too. It is recommended that for scales with overall scores and subscales, both should be reported. Especially as this has been done for test-retest reliability below.
* Page 9: The section in the discussion detailing the challenges during translation was really interesting. However, there was no mention of this in the results section. Perhaps could some detail be added in the results section, maybe including how many items there were difficulties with, all words/phrases there were challenges with/how these were dealt with? This would then lead onto the discussion section, which could be supplemented with other literature which has found similar challenges with translating certain words/phrases? For example, there was a special supplement within the Indian Journal of Rheumatology looking at "Outcome measures in rheumatology". This covered some of the challenges in relation to translation and cultural adaption.
* Page 11: Appropriate and concise conclusions have been drawn.
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