

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

Osame Salim

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Author(s)

Thank you for your interesting paper. I have reviewed your manuscript and would like to provide my feedback. Your research topic is both relevant and timely, given the increasing focus on healthcare communication skills which have been shown to be linked to good patient outcomes in many areas. However, there are some aspects of the manuscript that could be addressed for further consideration.

Abstract:

- Your abstract provides an overview of the methodology and results. However, it might benefit from even more explicit stating of the aim of the research and the problem being addressed, early in the text.
- The statement "The results will need to be compared after further evaluation" is unclear and could be better phrased. Are you suggesting that the study's findings should be compared with those of future studies? If so, please state this clearly.

Introduction:

- The introduction provides a comprehensive background and literature review. It might be beneficial to include a more precise problem statement, which would make the research objective clearer.
- In some areas, you might want to cut down on redundant or repetitive sentences, for instance, the repeated emphasis on the importance of effective communication in healthcare.
- Your introduction could also benefit from a more structured and clear argument, with explicit aims to guide the reader.

Methods:

- The methodology section is generally well written. However, you might wish to clarify why a three-year professional experience was one of the inclusion criteria for the study.
- It would be beneficial to provide more details on how you dealt with missing data, as simply replacing missing values with an average might not always be the most appropriate method.
- In the analysis section, you might want to include a justification for your chosen statistical methods and fit indices.

Results:

- Your presentation of the results is generally sound. The usage of first- and second-order confirmatory factor analysis is well.
- The reported average age of 68.36 years appears to be incorrect or out of the given age range of 22 to 61 years. This discrepancy needs to be resolved.
- Lastly, it would be helpful to see some descriptive statistics for the seven factors in the ICSS to understand the distribution of responses among these factors. This could provide useful insights into which communication skills are more prominent among the health staff in this study.

Discussion:

- Your discussion on the validity and reliability of the ICSS tool is clear and compelling. However, it would be valuable to further discuss why the seven-factor solution is most appropriate for the ICSS, as compared to alternative models with different numbers of factors. What led you to choose this model? Could other models be equally or more valid?
- Also, cultural factors were discussed as influencing ICSS. However, there is a lack of depth in discussing how such cultural differences in the Iranian context could specifically influence ICSS results. Offering specific examples or contextual factors could enrich your discussion.

Conclusion:

- Your conclusion presents a clear, convincing argument for the validity and utility of the ICSS in the Iranian healthcare context. However, the call for replication in other populations is somewhat vague. Elaborating on which populations you think should be targeted for future research could make your conclusion stronger.

The changes suggested above should improve the clarity and flow of your manuscript. I look forward to reading a revised version of your work.

Sincerely, Dear Author(s)

Thank you for your interesting paper. I have reviewed your manuscript and would like to provide my feedback. Your research topic is both relevant and timely, given the increasing focus on healthcare communication skills which have been shown to be linked to good patient outcomes in many areas. However, there are some aspects of the manuscript that could be addressed for further consideration.

Abstract:

- Your abstract provides an overview of the methodology and results. However, it might benefit from even more explicit stating of the aim of the research and the problem being addressed, early in the text.
- The statement "The results will need to be compared after further evaluation" is unclear and could be better phrased. Are you suggesting that the study's findings should be compared with those of future studies? If so, please state this

clearly.

Introduction:

- The introduction provides a comprehensive background and literature review. It might be beneficial to include a more precise problem statement, which would make the research objective clearer.
- In some areas, you might want to cut down on redundant or repetitive sentences, for instance, the repeated emphasis on the importance of effective communication in healthcare.
- Your introduction could also benefit from a more structured and clear argument, with explicit aims to guide the reader.

Methods:

- The methodology section is generally well written. However, you might wish to clarify why a three-year professional experience was one of the inclusion criteria for the study.
- It would be beneficial to provide more details on how you dealt with missing data, as simply replacing missing values with an average might not always be the most appropriate method.
- In the analysis section, you might want to include a justification for your chosen statistical methods and fit indices.

Results:

- Your presentation of the results is generally sound. The usage of first- and second-order confirmatory factor analysis is well.
- The reported average age of 68.36 years appears to be incorrect or out of the given age range of 22 to 61 years. This discrepancy needs to be resolved.
- Lastly, it would be helpful to see some descriptive statistics for the seven factors in the ICSS to understand the distribution of responses among these factors. This could provide useful insights into which communication skills are more prominent among the health staff in this study.

Discussion:

- Your discussion on the validity and reliability of the ICSS tool is clear and compelling. However, it would be valuable to further discuss why the seven-factor solution is most appropriate for the ICSS, as compared to alternative models with different numbers of factors. What led you to choose this model? Could other models be equally or more valid?
- Also, cultural factors were discussed as influencing ICSS. However, there is a lack of depth in discussing how such cultural differences in the Iranian context could specifically influence ICSS results. Offering specific examples or contextual factors could enrich your discussion.

Conclusion:

- Your conclusion presents a clear, convincing argument for the validity and utility of the ICSS in the Iranian healthcare

context. However, the call for replication in other populations is somewhat vague. Elaborating on which populations you think should be targeted for future research could make your conclusion stronger.

The changes suggested above should improve the clarity and flow of your manuscript. I look forward to reading a revised version of your work.

Sincerely, Osame Salim