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

Gwendolyn Mayer[1]

1 Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The authors present data of a survey in a sample of Iranian healthcare staff in order to confirm the 7-factor structure of the interpersonal communication skills scale. The results are useful for the future use of the scale. However, some improvements will be necessary before publication.

1. A native speaker should revise the whole text and check for grammar and typos. Some sentences are incomplete or their word order is wrong.

2. The introduction should be better structured. Many aspects of the importance of communication skills in the healthcare systems are mentioned, however, the reader gets confused, as it does not totally get clear, what is exactly meant by "interpersonal communication skills". Is Doctor-patient-communication included or does it only refer to interprofessional communication – which of course is of huge relevance. Sentences like "dynamic sharing between clients and healthcare providers" evoke the impression, that communication with patients is included as well.

Moreover, the authors mention educational abilities – here patient education is mentioned, but are medical education of students as well included or not?

In the discussion, finally, the authors write that "the effectiveness of communication between employees" has been measured. More precision in the choice of terms is needed.

3. There are already many measures on communication skills, can you please give a short overview and explain, what is added by the ICSS?

4. The 7 latent constructs should be explained in short. The term "the ability to clarify public speaking" is grammatically incorrect and should be reformulated

5. Was a missing data analysis performed? MAR, MCAR? How many values were replaced? Did the authors set a criterion on percentage of accepted missings?

6. Figures are missing?

7. Discussion: The authors promise a discussion on cultural values – were there specific results from the Iranian subgroup to be considered in this study?

8. Discussion and Conclusion: Psychometric validity is a term that does not exist. This is a work on construct validity. An external validation (criterion validity) will be either the next step or maybe has been done elsewhere.

In this context, nothing can be said about creditworthiness, if the criterion validity remains unclear. Even, if construct validation is a valuable step, it remains only one step on the way to all psychometric properties.

9. The title finally should be adapted accordingly.

10. Check for consistent use of the number of decimal paces. (means and SDs?)