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

Manolis Adamakis[1]

1 National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I would like to thank the authors for the time and effort taken to prepare this manuscript.

Introduction

- The Introduction should be split into paragraphs. Also, the text requires extensive syntax and grammar editing, as many sentences are not clear enough for the reader to understand them (see specific comments from previous reviewers).

- The Introduction provides an interesting background regarding the importance of communication skills; however, it is not focused on the main aim of the study, which is the validation of a tool to measure communication skills. I believe that the entire Introduction should be restructured and provide a more adequate and in-depth background of tools for measuring communication skills (not only a sentence like "There are several tools available to measure the ability of healthcare providers to provide high-quality healthcare, but few are currently available"), previous similar validation studies, more details about these studies (methods used and results), and a more adequate explanation why you decided to validate this specific tool and not another one. Also, a more detailed description of the instrument under validation should be presented.

- A more adequate statement about the purpose(s) of the study should be included, which will be clearly developed (in a separate paragraph) towards the end of the Introduction.

Method

- Sample and sampling procedure should include more information. Demographic information of the participants is missing, and should be included (e.g., age, gender, where did they come from, background, employment, etc.). Also, ethics approval and the consent to participate should be referenced in this part, highlighting the standards of voluntary and confidence.

- The authors should include references regarding the critical values or limit values for all fit indices (i.e., CFI, GFI, AGFI, NFI, SRMR, CN, RSMEA), and also references to support these critical values.

Results

- The first paragraph should be moved to the description of the participants, in the Methods section.

- Graphs and tables presenting the results are missing. Item loadings are not included.

- More information is needed such as the nature of the items, an example of each dimension and/or the basic reliability parameters of the instrument (e.g., alpha Cronbach coefficients).
- The Results includes only limited information, basically the description of the fit indices.
- Low fit indices appear in two results (GFI=0.82; AGFI=0.78). Tha authors should explain why this happened.
- Composite reliability (CR) and average variance extracted (AVE) should be used in order to indicate that the convergence and distinct validity of the proposed model is adequate, based on the Fornell & Larker (1981). The authors are requested to re-examine this part of their study.
- The Results section should be restructured and include more information, since many important information is missing. I would suggest the authors to have a look at other CFA validation studies in order to better understand what is needed to be presented.

Discussion

- The Discussion needs further development, as it is very limited.