

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

Ana Tavares

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The results are interesting. However, I raised some major concerns that need to be addressed.

## Abstract:

1. There is an error in the percentage that must be corrected "equal to % 44"
2. **Keywords:** ICSS, Psychometrics, Reliability, Validity, Importance Performance Map Analysis, CFA. Should contain the word communication since it is an important word for referencing the article and not only words related to the psychometric analysis of the scale

## Introduction:

1. Healthcare professionals and scientists should carefully consider their needs and pick the best instrument for measuring their desired elements based on the device's capability. Instrument properties and psychometric characteristics are important considerations when selecting an appropriate instrument<sup>[12]</sup>. I think that the important point of this sentence is to choose the instrument according to its psychometric properties to measure the variable under study and not based on the device's capability. It would be important to clarify what the point of this paragraph is.
2. "There are several tools available to measure the ability of healthcare providers to provide high-quality healthcare, but few are currently available" What are the instruments and why are they not available? If valid instruments exist, you need to identify some in literature.
3. "There are different ICSSs that serve different purposes. Some are designed for individuals to evaluate their own strengths and weaknesses in communicating with others while others are developed specifically for evaluating learners' ICSS in nursing education<sup>[14][15]</sup>. " Where does this scale fit in, why is being validated?
4. What is specific about this scale that evaluates communication in health professionals? Or is it a general communication scale that is being validated in only one context? If it is a general scale, would it be beneficial to validate it in the general population?
5. The introduction fails to provide a clear audience for the context in which the communication skills are relevant.

## Methods:

1. Participants: "Considering the nonresponses to completing the questionnaire (20%), we estimated the final sample size at 170 people." Did you estimate? How many completed the questionnaires? There needs to be more coherence

between the sections. Also, it is essential describe well the sample and how they were selected. There is a lack of information to make the study valid.

2. Measurement data: It fails to explain what the questionnaire evaluates. Again, is it specific to health care or general? Can you get a total score?
3. Vakili developed this questionnaire et al. in 2012 (16). It is necessary to correct this reference.

### **Results:**

1. In this study, 170 health staff took part in the Ahvaz health center. They were in the age group of 22 to 61 years with an average age of 68.36 years and a standard deviation of 52.7 years. Table 1 shows the distribution of health staff in terms of gender, level of education, marital status, history of job, and place of residence (Table 1). This should come in the description of the participants and not as a result of the study.
2. "They were in the age group of 22 to 61 years with an average age of 68.36 year" The average cannot be higher than the ages shown. Check the average again.

### **Discussion:**

1. We have considered the factor structure of EFA in past studies (16,17). Which studies do you refer to? The discussion should have a greater relation to the review in the introduction in order to give a logical sequence to the study.
2. Measuring the ICSS is a way to evaluate the effectiveness of communication between employees. It is necessary to understand whether the communication is between employees or with clients/ other people. The introduction and the selection of the sample seem to indicate the importance of attendance and the discussion is more about communication between employees.

Overall it is an interesting study, and the validation of scales for different contexts is fundamental, but it is important to define well the variable and to which population it can be applied.