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Reviewer’s report:

I very much enjoyed reading this paper and learned things from it which actually chime with my own experience. I think the themes you outline, which may induce measurement error, are very much worth highlighting in order that researchers do not fall into these traps with item wordings in the future. However, the one issue that am not yet clear on is how exactly this study relates to pilot and feasibility studies in general. I think this needs spelling out more clearly in the abstract and the introduction. There were quite a few language errors (outlined below) but none got in the way of comprehension of the text as a whole.

I give pages numbers as they appear on the PDF document I have, and I give lines as they appear on the PDF document to the left (i.e. 1 line number for each actual line)

Minor

P2, conclusions section: Please contextualise these conclusions more. They are currently too general for me to interpret. For example what is "the item bank approach"?, "Translation and validation studies provide a valuable source of inspiration for potential revisions" what does this mean?

P6, L2-3: Please could you joust give a line about what the quality review entailed?

P2: L22: I would perhaps add "PROMs" and "cognitive testing" to the keywords.

P5: L5: The figure needs to be much higher resolution to be easily readable.

P7, L8: I'm just wondering if there is a reason you did not record the interviews and transcribe. I'm wondering whether the fact people had to write might have inhibited their response, to some extent.

P8, L23: Please can you give examples of the statements of degree? In fact, please could you give an example question to illustrate these limitations in physical activities questions? I cannot really follow this section.

P9, L5: Please can you give this section a more descriptive title. I do not understand how the title relates to the content.
P11, L3: Please can you explain what "to think nonfiguratively" means at the beginning of this section?

P15, conclusion: Please could you add a paragraph before the current paragraph summarising the paper in more concrete terms?

Language

P2, L4: "than has been previously available"

P2, L13-14: "mobility aids" possibly? "canes"

P2, L14: "solutions"

P2, L6: Avoid one sentence paragraphs. Join with the previous or next paragraph.

P3, L2: "Over the past 20 years".

P3, L3-5: this sentence is not grammatically correct.

P4, L2: "banks permit"

P4, L4: "Computer Adaptive Test"

P5, L4: Why are the references not in the same set of square brackets?

P5, L8: "Danes"

P5, L18: "questionnaires"

P5, L21: "(who were both native Danish speakers but who had previously lived in English speaking countries for X and Y years)"

P5, L22: "careful documentation was made when ...."

P6, L10: delete "the" at the end of the line.

P6, L16: replace "regarded" with "concerned".

P6, L21: "adjustments were made to the response..."

P6, L22: replace "where after" with "Thereafter"

P6, L22: "interviews were completed"
P6, L22: replace "version" with "versions" (unless there was only one item changed)

P6, L23: "were a performed"?


P8, L7: put a comma after "eat"

P8, L7: Capital letter on "Several"

P8, L22: you say "the question". I do not know which question you are referring to.

P9, L5: do you mean "interviewee"?

P9, L7: "way too" is not academic language. Please replace with "far too" or "much too".

P10, L2: replace "differenced" with "differed"

P11, L3: please can you explain what "to think nonfiguratively" means in the text.

P13: L13: replace "judged" with "judging"

P14, L16: Insert "testing" after the word "cognitive".
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