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Reviewer's report:

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:

i) Initial translation (T1 and T2) translators background should be provided (i.e. bilingual translators?) What are the differences between the two translators? One being familiar with the field and one as a "naive" translator?

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

iii) Who evaluated the back translations?

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

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.

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

No

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

Unable to assess

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

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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