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

João Filipe Mendes Fundinho

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for the invitation to review this paper. This paper presents the validation of an instrument to measure interpersonal communication skills. There are several points I think that could improve the paper.

1. There are some grammatical issues across the text that hinder comprehension. I would recommend a native speaker to revise the text.

2. Some technical terms are not used correctly. In the title, for example, the term "psychometric" is used in isolation.

3. Introduction: The terms interpersonal communication skills, effective communication, and communication skills lack a clear definition and differentiation. They look like they are used interchangeably.

4. Introduction: the introduction lacks a clear organization. There are multiple jumps from topic to topic that get the reader lost. I recommend the use of subtitles to make it easier.

5. Introduction: I would recommend better describing what tool you are validating. At the end of the introduction, you state, "There are different ICSSs that serve different purposes.". We only get to know what ICSS you are validating in the methods section. Knowing more about the original and what makes it a good choice for your validation study would be great. It would also be great to know how the tool's dimensions are defined and what differentiates them.

6. Methods: Recommend replacing subjects for participants. "Participant" is adequate for human volunteers, while "subject" is used mainly for non-humans.

7. Methods: Missing values – how many missing values were there? What were the criteria to determine if a missing value was to be substituted? Why did you choose the average to replace missing values?

8. Methods: I recommend stating that the tool was also developed in Iran. Otherwise, the readers may wonder about the translation process.

9. Results: the number of decimal cases is inconsistent. I recommend using always the same number of decimal cases.

10. Results: I could not find the tables and figures.

11. Discussion: in the first paragraph, you state: "The present study attempted to design a valid and reliable scale for evaluating ICSS in healthcare staff.". I am confused; did the authors create the scale, or is this a validation from the tool created by Vakili and collaborators?

12. Discussion: the authors cannot compare their results because there were no other studies using CFA and this tool. However, in the introduction, there is mention of studies that use EFA. Were the results congruent with the structure found in these previous studies?

13. Discussion: I would have liked to read more about the latent variables. Why were these constructs important? What do

they mean? What is the theoretical relevance and distinction between the first-order and second-order models?