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Reviewer's report:

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:

Please provide the criteria to analyse the floor / ceiling effects

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

Please provide the magnitude of correlation in table 3 and 4. It is suggested to use the correlation coefficient

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.

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

Typo errors:

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

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

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:
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