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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer #1:

Thank you for providing me with the opportunity of reviewing this paper. The purpose of this investigation was the transcultural adaptation and psychometric validation of the Portuguese version of the SULCS in a sample of Portuguese stroke patients. Although this does have important applications to this handy scale as an assessment in the Portuguese stroke population, the manuscript lacks a detailed description of statistical analysis as well as the section of results.

Suggestion:

1.1) Please provide the criteria to analyse the floor / ceiling effects

R – H1 was replaced by the following “The SULCS scale presents no significant missing data and its distribution is spread over the various categories”. In the results section the changes were made accordingly, including the criteria to establish ceiling effects.

1.2) Please describe the process on how the test-retest reliability obtain, including when the 1st and 2nd testing time were.

R – As SULCS is supposed to be filled by clinicians, we only tested the agreement between two observers. Therefore, in the text there is no mention to test-retest.
1.3) Please provide the magnitude of correlation in table 3 and 4. It is suggested to use the correlation coefficient.

R – In this table, we did not intend to present correlations between the variables. The table present the results for comparison of means. Therefore, we changed the table title, removing the reference to correlations. The manuscript text was also changed accordingly.

1.4) page 11, line 43 "Participants with good hand function according to SULCS showed better...". Is the "better" means statistically higher in the mean score? Please show the result of post-hoc multiple comparison analyses in table 4.

R – The results of post-hoc multiple comparison analyses are now presented in table 4.

1.5) Table 1: Please add the information of "Female", "Left laterality", etc.

R – This information was added to the table.

1.6) Typo errors:

page 11: line 16 "...good hand functioning", rather than "...good hang function"

R – We thank the reviewer for identifying this issue, which was corrected.

1.7) Table 3: replace the "coma /," of p-value to "full stop/ ." example: p-value should be "0.486", rather than "0,486"

R – We thank the reviewer for identifying this issue, which was corrected.

Reviewer #2:

For this being a transcultural adaptation and validation study, the translation procedures are too brief described with only a paragraph with insufficient details. Although there is no "gold standard" for translation guidelines, certain elements and details should be included in the methods section. Below are points that should be clarified with specific information provided:

2.1) Initial translation (T1 and T2) translators background should be provided (i.e. bilingual translators?)
Both translations were independently performed by bilingual translators. This information was added to the methods section.

2.2) What are the differences between the two translators? One being familiar with the field and one as a "naive" translator?

Both translators were bilingual, one professional translator and the other a PhD, teacher of English. This information was added to the methods section.

2.3) Who was involved in the process of the synthesis of translation to come with the consensus of the version it ended up to be?

The authors PLF and JPB were responsible for the consensus version. This information was added to the methods section.

2.4) Who evaluated the back translations?

The back-translation was performed by an English professional translator and then evaluated by the authors PLF, JPB, and JPP. This information was added to the methods section.

2.5) Who was included in the expert committee? Professionals? Nonprofessionals? Translators? Nothing was stated in the study.

The expert committee included physicians specialised in physical medicine and rehabilitation, physiotherapists, occupational therapists, and experts in statistical methods used for transcultural adaptation of assessment instruments. This information was included in the text.

2.6) Furthermore, English needs to be polished with grammatical and spelling mistakes. Sentences fluidity and flow should be improved. The above points should be addressed before any further consideration.

After the revisions were completed, the text was subject to English review aimed at improving grammar, spelling and style.