Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies
Volume 8 · Issue 2 · e112089

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Cross-cultural Adaptation, Validity, and Reliability of the Persian Utrecht Scale for Evaluation of Rehabilitation-Participation in Spinal Cord Injury Patients

Amir Javanmard, Kianoush Abdi, Abbas Ebadi, Samaneh Hosseinzadeh

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
14 Dec 2020	24 Feb 2021	24 Feb 2021	10.5812/mejrh.112089

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** hamid Dalvand, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 8
3 **Revision 2** Editor-in-Chief 9
Authors' reply to reviewers 10
Reviewer and editor comments 11

1 Original submission

3 comments · 25 Dec 2020 – 6 Jan 2021

hamid Dalvand Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 25 Dec 2020

Dear AE,
This is an interesting study about the cross-cultural adaptation, validity, and reliability of the Persian Utrecht scale for Evaluation of Rehabilitation-Participation in spinal cord injury patients. The paper is generally well written and structured. However, in my opinion, there are some comments that the authors should pay more attention to. These are listed below:
1- It is really necessary to provide the ethics committee approval code for the study.
2- The authors should calculate the floor and ceiling effects in the study.
3- It would be better if the authors performed the factor analysis and presented the screen plot of P-USER in the study.
4- It seems that the authors need to calculate the absolute reliability in the study.
5- The study needs some editing by a native English speaker.
Thanks.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 4 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,
Comments for the authors:
- Table 2: delete the Persian sentence.
- All abbreviations used in the tables should be defined in the table legends.
Thanks.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 6 Jan 2021

Dear Authors
According to the reviewers' and associate editor's comments, your article needs major revision. Please revise the manuscript and respond to each reviewer's comments separately.
Thanks.

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.

Dear Reviewers, The authors sincerely appreciate your helpful comments. We highlighted the new sentences in the manuscript as well as mentioning them in the replies. Thank you.

Reviewer #1 comments

The abstract part: Some sentences are repetitive but the method section is incomplete.

R: The methods section of the abstract has been revised in lines 16-20.

1- The method for determining construct validity was not discriminant validity. It seems that you wanted to use the "known-groups" method, but instead of comparing healthy individuals with spinal cord injuries, you should compare subgroups in spinal cord injuries.

R: Dear reviewer, Thanks for your constructive comment. The method we applied was discriminant validity that compares healthy and SCI individuals. This has been corrected in the text lines 230-235.

2- It would be better if the researcher also calculated the qualitative content validity by CVI &CVR

R: Dear reviewer, according to Haynes et al[1], the evaluation of qualitative content validity includes reviewing qualities such as grammar, wording, item allocation, and scaling by experts. We didn't chose quantitative content validity as the instrument were developed beforehand and the authors' chief aim was the translation of the questionnaire.

3- It is not clear how normal people and SCI patients were selected

R: The sampling method has been explained at lines 97-100.

4- The number of experts is not specified

R: The Number of experts has been specified in the text (line 157).

5- References: The references are mostly outdated and about a third of the articles are under 2,000

R: Dear reviewer, thanks for your supervision, the authors were also insisted on using novel references in the text, therefore, some of the references were replaced with newer literature, but some references remained as they were essential for the methodology of the study.

---

[1] Haynes SN, Richard D, Kubany ES. Content validity in psychological assessment: A functional approach to concepts and methods. Psychological assessment. 1995 Sep;7(3):238.

Reviewer #2 comments

1- *It is really necessary to write the Committee Ethical Code of study.*
R: Dear reviewer, we wrote the ethical code in the acknowledgments section.

2- You should calculate the floor and ceiling effects in your study.
*R: Thanks for your constructive comment .F*loor and ceiling effects occurred in the data, since this questionnaire is based on limitation of people (SCI and healthy), so SCI persons experience higher limitations (low scores) and healthy individuals experience lower limitations (high score)[2](1). This effects is natural. If you have other suggestion for solving this problem, we would kindly appreciate your suggestions.

3- It would be better you did the factor analysis and present the screen plot of P-USER in your study

R: Dear reviewer, Thanks for your constructive comment. We didn't perform factor analysis as the different subscales of P-USER had different scoring criteria; therefore, it wasn't possible to calculate factor analysis.

4- It seems that you need to calculate the absolute reliability in your study?

R: Thanks for your constructive comment. The absolute ICC has been calculated and replaced in the study.

5- study need some editing by a native English person

R: Thanks for your comment. The manuscript has been revised by a native English-speaking person.

Reviewer #3 *comments*

1. *Please edit the manuscript, some word are not common in scientific writing such as "Objectives: To attain a valid, reliable instrument for evaluation of participation in Persian-speaking SCI patients"*
Re: Dear reviewer, the mentioned sentence has been revised based on your comment.

[2] Polit DF, Yang F. *Measurement and the measurement of change: a primer for the health professions*. Wolters Kluwer Philadelphia, PA; 2016.

2. I am wonder which one is more important the questionnaire or the cross cultural. The manuscript begins wit"The transcultural adaptation is the process of developing an evaluation instrument which is equal to the original but adapted to a different language and cultural setting(1, 2)."

Re: Thanks for your supervision. The first sentence of the manuscript have been replaced with a sentence about the questionnaire.

3. One the most reason for SCI is burden of caregiver which has economical and social burden please mention this point in the introduction you can find some suggestion in this article"Psychometric properties of Persian version of the Caregiver Burden Scale in Iranian caregivers of patients with spinal cord injury"

Re: Thank you for your guidance; your mentioned reference has been cited in the manuscript at lines 66-68

4. please insert the ethical code

Re: Dear Reviewer, we inserted the ethical code in the acknowledgments section.

5. "The sample size of the population selected according to the rule of thumb principle, therefore the final sample consisted of 150persons with SCI." how calculate?

Re: The principle of calculation have been included at lines 96-100.

6. Do you have any permission from developer?

Re: The consent of the main developer has been obtained by Email and has been included as a figure attached to the manuscript, as well as had mentioned in method section.

7. Construct validity tested by discriminant validity, which is one of five ways proposed by Cronbach for assessment of construct validity(1) "what do you mean?

Re: The sentence has been revised and highlighted in the text at lines 230-235.

8. Please add the cut off for ICC and alpha Cronbach

Re: Thanks for your constructive comment. This section has been added to the manuscript lines 239-241.

9. "In this study,Coefficients of internal consistency and test-retest reliability showed" in discussion is not common

Re: The sentence has been removed from the discussion.

10. Please rewrite the discussion based on your result

The discussion has been revised based on strengths of the study and more comparison with similar studies.

2 Revision 1

4 comments · 31 Jan 2021 – 15 Feb 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 31 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
Thanks for the authors' attention.
Thanks.

Referee 2 Reviewer

ACCEPT 2 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
The authors have made all the corrections.
Thanks.

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 14 Feb 2021

Dear EIC,
Are the authors sure they wrote the Ethical Code (IR.USWR.REC.1397) correctly?
Thanks.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 15 Feb 2021

Dear Author,
Thank you for improving the quality of the article. However, some grammatical problems are still observed in the manuscript. It is suggested that the article be edited by a native editor and that you send a confirmation letter to the journal so that the article can be accepted for publication. In addition, the manuscript should be consistent with the journal's format.
Thanks.

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.

Thanks for your constructive comments.

The article has edited by native editor and send the confirmation certification and the manuscript has revised with the format of journal. In addition, Ethic code has corrected

Best regarded ,abdi.

---

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 24 Feb 2021

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 24 Feb 2021

Dear Author,
We are pleased to inform you that your article has been accepted for publication in this journal. We hope to receive further articles from your team.
Thanks.