

Review of: "Psychometric of the interpersonal communication skills scale: A confirmatory factor analysis"

Alex Marson¹

¹ University of Padua

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thanks for the opportunity to review this work; the study is interesting and tackles a very important issue. Hereby are my suggestions for improving the paper.

Abstract/Results

- Typo: % 44 > 44 %
- Typo: "...the the adequacy and their desirability..." > "their adequacy and desirability"

Abstract/Conclusions

- Style: I would rephrase the whole paragraph; I find it to be not as effective as it could in conveying the intended message.

Introduction:

- Style: I find the text structure to be quite fragmented; I would consider a restructuring in order to make it more consequential and easy to follow for the reader.
- Style: Subtitles could help the reader follow step-by-step the points which are explored (e.g., "The role of ICS in healthcare", "Measuring ICS", and so forth).
- Typo: "*were less given attention*" > "were devoted less attention"

Methods:

- Unclear: "*According to the current study, 7 constructs (latent) were among the main components of CS.*" I would recommend to provide more information about this preliminary hypothesis at this point of the paper.
- Unclear: "*We made the selection of people with maximum diversity. Diversity means that employees from all areas of the healthcare system and with different jobs could join*" > "In selecting the participants, no limitations were established according to their ward or type of job within the healthcare system". This point is not very clear to me: not limiting the inclusion to certain characteristics and actively selecting the participants to have a more diverse composition of the sample are different procedures. I suggest specifying the procedure steps more in detail.
- Style: "*The tool used in the study was a questionnaire measuring ICSS with 30 items.*"

Vakili developed this questionnaire et al." > "The questionnaire used for the present study was a 30-item form of the ICSS devised by Vakili and colleagues (2012)"

Results:

- Unclear: How can the mean age be so high (and greater than the upper boundary of the age range)? I recommend checking this passage.
- Unclear: Tables are referred to, but they are missing.

Discussion:

- Style: *"From the articles, it can be inferred that when a scale"* > "The existing literature suggests that the administration of a scale... (ref.)"
- Unclear: *"Measuring the ICSS is a way to evaluate the effectiveness of communication between employees"* if this is the case, it could have been beneficial to state this way before, introducing the reader to the specific use of the scale; conversely, the introduction seemed to me more generic, including staff-patient communication as well.
- Unclear: Figures are referred to, but they are missing.
- Unclear: *"Since we have shown the seven factors in ICSS as a fundamental and specific need for healthcare staff"* > I suggest reporting how the literature highlighted these constructs as fundamental intervention targets to fulfill the staff's needs, rather than taking a first-person stance: the findings of the study was about the factor structure of the scale, not about its relationship with the staff needs.
- Unclear: *"We found that all extracted factors had high reliability and validity. The results confirmed sufficient empirical support for the reliability and validity of ICSS..."* > "The ICSS in its 30-item 7-subscale form demonstrated strong factor validity, as demonstrated by GFI, CFI, as well as other fit indices. Additionally, the factors within the ICSS exhibited high internal consistency, indicating a reliable measurement of each construct".
- Unclear: *"ICSS can be influenced by various factors. Cultural factors such as language, belief systems, morality, and perspective. Also, personal and family characteristics can play a role in shaping it."* > I wouldn't say that ICSS itself can be influenced by those factors, I would rather specify which of its aspects can. For instance, "the factor structure of ICSS can be influenced..."; unless the point is ICS instead of ICSS, and in that case, the typo should be checked.
- Unclear: *"respondents' experiences with their ICSS"* > "respondents' experiences with their ICS": if I am getting it right, the point is Interpersonal Communication Skills, not the Interpersonal communication Skills Scale.

Conclusions:

- Unclear: *"The ICSS was proven to be a valuable tool for healthcare staff when dealing with clients"* > I wouldn't advance such a statement, unless in this study the scale were used specifically to assess a single target interaction between a healthcare staff member and a client. Maybe this was the case, but it has not been stated in the paper so far. Conversely, I would say that the ICSS had proven useful to reliably evaluate the factors affecting communication quality among the staff itself.
- Unclear: *"Its psychometric validity"* > "its good psychometric characteristics"

- Unclear: “*This, in turn, helps healthcare professionals make informed decisions about client care and treatment*” >
“This means ICSS has the potential to help healthcare professionals to better assess and improve their ICS, in order to make their decisions about client care and treatment more informed” (again, it is not clear whether the scale is intended to assess the communication between staff members, staff members and patients, or both).