Journal of Nursing and Midwifery Sciences
Volume 10 · Issue 3 · e139931

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Reliability and Validity of the Chinese Version of the Perceived Access to Health Care Questionnaire

Dongyang Wang, Thitipong Tankumpuan, Ketsarin Utriyaprasit, Patricia M. Davidson

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
11 Aug 2023	10 Sep 2023	12 Sep 2023	10.5812/jnms-139931

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Associate Editor 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 7
3 **Revision 2** Editor-in-Chief 8
Authors' reply to reviewers 9
Reviewer and editor comments 10

1 Original submission

1 comment · 28 Aug 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 28 Aug 2023

Review comments on the article with code 139876:

- In the methods of the abstract section: please mention the study design, country, state, study population, sampling method, and native translation.
- In the background section: please explain more about the context and population characteristics (cultures, ethnicity, religion, …) of your study and describe the necessity and importance of this research in your area. The rationale for the study must be explained more accurately.

- In the background section: please explain the history of the questionnaire, such as its developer, the year, and where or when the tool was developed.

- In the methods: Please write about the study design and explain more about simple random sampling. Also, provide references for the validity and reliability section. Include the COSMIN checklist in an appendix to confirm the accuracy of the process.
- In the methods: please show the process of conducting your study in a figure.

- In the discussion: there was no need to mention numbers and quantitative values. Please discuss and interpret the findings of your study in qualitative terms.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Reviewer 3:

Question:

1. Background is too long, The first paragraph should be about access to health care. In other words, show its importance with numbers and if there is no access, what will be the consequences for health (please express with numbers and indicators)

Reply: We revised the background, and put the statistics of the access to health care in this paragraph. As shown in Page 2 Paragraph 1.

2. Please separate the sample of the test-retest (by detail) and the full sample.

Reply: We separate the study samples and test-retest samples following the reviewers suggestions as shown in Page 5 under 3.2 Population and samples section.

3. What is your assumed intraclass correlation coefficient for Sample size calculation?

Reply: We added the alpha value in Page 6 Paragraph 1.

4. “ simple random sampling method.”Please describe in detail.

Reply: We add the details of simple random samplings as shown in Page 6 Paragraph 3

5. Write here briefly if you did cultural debugging. Did he/she were native Chinese and fluent in English master who compared and analyzed the first two translated versions?

Reply: We added the cultural debugging in Page 7 Paragraph 3 and revised the translation coordinator following reviewers suggestions as shown in Page 7 Paragraph 3.

6. After the finalization of the translation, the back translation should be done. Why didn't you do or write? Please describe the characteristics of the people who back translated.

Reply: The back translation we mentioned in Page 7 Paragraph 3 under 3.4 Translation and cross-cultural adaptation section.

7. Did you ask for linguistic appropriateness, semantic comprehension, and content acceptability?

Reply: We revised it following reviewer suggestions as shown in Page 8 Paragraph 2.

8. Rewrite mean SD

Reply: We revised it following reviewer suggestions as shown in Page 11 Paragraph 2.

9. Use of the terms such as more, few, low, and ... in results is not appropriate.

We revised it following reviewer suggestions as shown in Page 11 Paragraph 3.

Reviewer 4:

Question:

1. In the methods of abstract section: please mention the study design, country, state and population of the study, how to sample, and native translation.

Reply: We added “This study developed and validated the Chinese version of the PAHCQ questionnaire. The translation of PAHCQ was based on back translation of Brislin. This study included a sample of 591 subjects in Jiangsu, China using simple random sampling” as shown in Page 1 Paragraph 2.

2. In the background section: please explain more about the context and population characteristics (cultures, ethnicity, religion …..) of your study and describe the necessity and importance of this research in your area, and the reason of study must be taken more accurate.

Reply: We added the context and population characteristics and the necessity and importance of this research following reviewer’s suggestion as shown in Page 4 Paragraph 2.

3. In the background section: please explain about questionnaire history such as maker, year, and where it makes or the time of tool development.

Reply: We added the questionnaire history, manufacturer, year, manufacturing location, and tool development time as shown in Page 3 Paragraph 2.

4. In the methods: Please write about study design, explain more how about simple random sampling. Also, make references for validity and reliability section. make cosmin checklist in appendix for confirmatory and accuracy of process.

Reply: We added the study design in Page 5 under 3.1 section. we explained the details of simple random samplings as shown in Page 6 Paragraph 3. Added references for validity and reliability section and make cosmin checklist in the attached file.

5. In the methods: please show in figure the process of your study executing.

Reply: We added the process of my study executing in Figure 1.

6. In the discussion: there was no necessary mention numbers and quatitatative values in discussion. Please discuss and interprate the finding of your study in qulitative values.

Reply: According to the reviewer's suggestion, we have removed the relevant content on quantitative data and numbers from the article

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 9 Sep 2023 – 9 Sep 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 9 Sep 2023

I would like to thank the authors for their efforts. Please request that the confirmatory factor analysis model be included in the article.
dear editor

And then it will be acceptable!
Best wishes

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 9 Sep 2023

Dear author

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Reviewer 1:

Question:

I would like to thank the authors for their efforts. Please request that the confirmatory factor analysis model be included in the article

Reply: We added the confirmatory factor analysis model in the article as suggested on page 29 figure 2.

---

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 12 Sep 2023

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 12 Sep 2023

Dear author
Congratulations.