Date: 03/ 06/ 2019

To

The Editor-in-Chief

Galen Medical Journal (GMJ)

Subject: Revision and resubmission of manuscript ID #1587

Dear Editor,

We are grateful to you for your letter and the opportunity to revise our manuscript on “**A Closer Look at the Validity and Reliability of the Persian Versions of National Institute of Health Stroke Scale and Modified National Institute of Health Stroke Scale in Hospitalized Patients**”. The suggestions offered by the reviewer have been immensely helpful, and we also appreciate your comments on revising the manuscript.

We exerted the reviewer comments immediately after receiving this letter and responded to them separately, indicating exactly how we addressed each concern or problem and describing the changes we have made. The revisions have been approved by two authors. The changes are marked in the manuscript track changes systems.

In order to expedite the review process, we designed a table to reply reviewers' comments. The manuscript revision has been performed by using the track changes mode in MS Word. We have modified the manuscript according to the suggestions raised by the reviewers and believe that the manuscript has been significantly improved. We hope it will now be suitable for publication in the Galen Medical Journal (GMJ).

Thank you again for considering our revised manuscript.

Yours sincerely,

*Corresponding author*:

**Mehrdad Amir Behghadami**

Iranian Center of Excellence in Health Management

School of Health Services Management and Medical Informatics

Tabriz University of Medical Sciences

University Rd, Golbad

EAZN 5165665811

Tabriz, Iran

Mobil: +989141018718; E-mail: [Behghadami.m@gmail.com](mailto:Behghadami.m@gmail.com), Behghadamim@tbzmed.ac.ir

**Reply to the reviewer’ comments**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Original comments of the reviewer** | **Reply by the authors** | **Changes done on page number and line number** |
| **Reviewer A** | | |
| Thank you! We found your comments helpful and have revised accordingly. | | |
| 1. Please write a running title for this manuscript. | We have now added the following sentences as a running title.  **“Improving the quality of reports on psychometric studies”**  Please refer to the pages mentioned. | Page 1  Please see tracked changes. |
| 1. In the main text, the references number must be in bracket [ ]. | All reference numbers were entered in bracket [ ]. | Page 2-3  Please see tracked changes. |
| 1. The references must be written in Vancouver style. Some of the references need revision. You can download the GMJ Endnote style which available in http://www.gmj.ir. Listing references, follow abbreviate names of journals according to the journal list in PubMed. | Reference was made according to the Vancouver style. All journal names have been abbreviated according to the PubMed web. References were edited according to the journal guideline. | Page 3  Please see tracked changes. |
| 1. There are some grammar errors that need to be corrected. | We have edited the grammatical errors with the assistance of a native English language editor. | Page 2-3  Please see tracked changes. |
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Dear Editor,

The present letter concerns the article written by Dehghani, et al [1]. First off, we appreciate the efforts made by the editors of *Galen Medical Journal (GMJ)* to help publish such an important article. However, the present methodological approach of the mentioned study indicates some flaws resulting from the negligence of the authors, which has led to ambiguous interpretation of the results. This letter aims to help readers understand the matter better. Therefore, some of the points expressed in this letter indicate what is yet essential to confirm valid and reliable scales.

Psychometric studies can be very effective and valuable for health-care workers since such studies provide valid and reliable scales [2]. One the one hand, an accurate and appropriate study design, helps researchers plan the study decently. On the other hand, it can direct readers either toward what has been or will be conducted in a study. Hence, in order to be more transparent, it is suggested that in psychometric studies, researchers apply an appropriate study design.

In recent years, the increase in the number of multicultural studies has urged the need to adapt scales in order to be used in other languages [3]. Hence, depending on different cultures, the scales should be culturally modified and adapted [2]. Regarding this point, cross-cultural adaptation should be used as the study design. This design, i.e. cross-cultural adaptation, consists of translation, adaptation, calculation of validity, reliability and, responsiveness [3]. Nevertheless, it seems that validity assessment needs to be clarified.

Content validity is a crucial component of psychometric studies, which must be performed independent of the translation phase [4]. The content validity of scales can be assessed by means of modified KAPPA (modified CVI), which employs both quantitative and qualitative approach. It is done in a way that Persian version of the scales is assessed through using the viewpoints of the panel of experts [5]. This panel consists of specialists who have research experience or worked in the field [5]. And, the specialists are asked to present their own ideas to improve the quality of the scales and also to judge the existing items in terms of clarity and relevance [6]. These two criteria can be separately considered on a 4-point Likert scale by the specialists [6, 7]. As a result, to calculate Kappa coefficient (modified CVI) based on these two criteria, each item in the Likert scale is ranked according to experts’ view. Given this, for each item of the scale, Kappa (modified CVI) is calculated as the number of experts, who ranked 3 or 4, divided by the total number of the experts [6].

In conclusion, as psychometric studies present valid and reliable scales to investigate health-related issues and design future studies, it is crucial that the results should be reported in an accurate method. In order to improve validity, it is suggested that the authors report their findings on the content validity of the scales so that the CVI of each item on the scales is determined.
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