Reviewer's report

Title: Reliability, validity and psychometric properties of the Greek translation of the Major Depression Inventory

Authors:

Konstantinos N Fountoulakis (kfount@med.auth.gr)
Apostolos Iacovides (kfount@med.auth.gr)
Soula Kleanthous (kfount@med.auth.gr)
Stavros Samolis (samolis@med.auth.gr)
Kyriskos Gougoulias (gougoulias@med.auth.gr)
George St Kaprinis (kaprinis@med.auth.gr)
Per Bech (gabean@fa.dk)

Version: 1 Date: 28 Sep 2002

Reviewer: Dr GI Iverson

Level of interest: A paper whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Advice on publication: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the compulsory revisions

This is a study on the reliability and validity of the Greek Translation of the Major Depression Inventory. To my knowledge, it's the first attempt at translation and psychometric evaluation of this depression screening test. Thus, it makes a unique contribution to the literature.

This is an impressive, preliminary study on the reliability and validity of this instrument.

Compulsory Revisions

1. Abstract & Conclusion. The authors should not refer to this test as "reliable and valid." This grossly over-simplifies these aspects of psychometrics. This study has demonstrated very preliminary aspects of internal consistency, test-retest reliability, and classification accuracy. Much additional psychometric research is needed before this test can be used confidentially and accurately in Greece.

2. The cutoff score for depression could be stated more precisely. What, exactly, does 26/27 mean?

3. The Background section is very weak and inaccurate. The literature review is extremely limited and the conclusions are incorrect. For example, the Beck Depression Inventory Second Edition was published in 1996. The Reynolds Depression Inventory, published by PAR, is an very well-validated test. The authors clearly misunderstand the vast North American literature on depression screening tests. In my view, this paper should not try to justify the MDI by suggesting that it's the best available instrument and others are extremely limited. Rather, it's better to simply stick to the point: the test was translated, carefully, into Greek and a preliminary psychometric study was conducted.

4. The authors should comment on limitations of their study. For example, the test-retest study is based on only 18 subjects. The factor analysis is based on mixed sample of patients and controls.
5. The "gold standard" for diagnosis is consensus among clinicians. Many depression researchers would expect a comment about the limitations of this as a gold standard.

6. In the factor analysis, technically you can't have a one-variable factor. Thus, you have a one-factor solution. Why a varimax rotation? Why not an oblique? Was varimax used in previous research?

7. Figure 2 seems unnecessary.

8. Overall, the paper is quite well written, given that it is the authors' second language. It is not, however, very well written. There are still quite a few minor problems with the style, grammar, and phraseology.

This is a good study that adds to the literature. The Introduction is very weak and is not accurate regarding the state of the literature. It would be prudent to eliminate this material and simply say: (1) what is the MDI, (2) how has it been used, (3) the purpose of this study was to carefully translate it into Greek and conduct a preliminary psychometric study.
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