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Reviewer's report:

The paper titled "The Italian version of the Physical Therapy Patient Satisfaction Questionnaire (PTPSQ-I(15)). Psychometric properties in a sample of inpatients" describes the evaluation of psychometric properties of the Physical Therapy Patient Satisfaction Questionnaire in 148 Italian inpatients. The authors report good psychometric properties in terms of internal consistency, re-test-stability and construct validity. The authors suggest further studies for testing the concurrent validity of the psychometric properties, which in my opinion should have been done for divergent validity testing.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1) Background: "Divergent validity was investigated..." In my opinion the correlation with the Global Perceived Effect Questionnaire is convergent validity and not divergent validity. To assess construct validity, you should first establish convergent validity, before testing for divergent validity.

2) Psychometric Characteristics, Acceptability: "No questions were left unanswered...", but in table 2 there are 9 items with missing values, please explain

Minor Essential Revisions

1) Background: "The original version of the questionnaire consists of 26 items, of which 20 explore ..." This sentence is a bit confusing, when deleting 5 items from 26 a version of 21 items should result. Since in the original paper already only 20 items were taken, if would be better to reformulate- Background: "Divergent validity was investigated..." the sentence in order to avoid confusion. In the original paper the following is stated: 'From the instruments in the Compendium and other sources, 20 items were generated for the instrument that we used in our study.'

2) Background: "...and indicated high internal validity..." instead of validity it should read consistency

3) Background: "...and to adapt the original..." instead of and it should read in order to

4) Background: Reference 3 is not fitting in my opinion, in the text it is reported that the Italian version of the PTPSQ-I was administered to 315 Italian outpatients, while reference 3 reports about the Oswestry index for low back pain
in Arab population.

5) Background: please provide some information on the answer categories of the PTPSQ-I(15)

6) Background: "... 5 items were excluded from the PTPSQ-I..." please explain why these items were excluded

7) Background: "Both the US version and the Italian version..."

8) Methods: "The administration of questionnaires followed the same methods employed in our previous study on PTPSQ." The procedure should be explained here shortly as well, since the reader has not always the possibility to access the author article, but would need this information in order to understand the study procedure.

9) Methods: use the direct article 'the' for the questionnaires, since there is only this one existing "...the PTPSQ-I(15), ... the 5-point Likert-type scale evaluating the Global Perceived Effect..."

10) Methods: - Reference 6 does not seem really appropriate; since in this article the test-retest period is reported for another age group (school-aged children instead of adults) and for respondents from another culture (China instead of Western Europe). I would recommend to chose a reference which is more appropriate (e.g. Deyo RA, Diehr P, Patrick DL. Reproducibility and responsiveness of health status measures. Statistics and strategies for evaluation. Control Clin Trials. 1991 Aug;12(4 Suppl):142S-158S. OR Marx RG, Menezes A, Horovitz L, Jones EC, Warren RF.A comparison of two time intervals for test-retest reliability of health status instruments. J Clin Epidemiol. 2003 Aug;56(8):730-5.)

11) Statistical analysis: ICC (3,1) should be explained to the reader. Please provide reference such as Shrout and Fleiss, Intraclass correlations: uses in assessing rater reliability, Psychological Bulletin 1979 86:420-428 or equivalent reference

12) Results, Subjects: "...our sample consists of 148 inpatients..."

13) Psychometric Characteristics, Reliability: You should refer in the text that Q15 (r=0.261) has a item-total correlation below the critical value of r=.0.30, by contrast Q11 has a r=0.526 which is quite good.

14) Discussion: "Similar reliability coefficients...were obtained in an Italian validation study on an instrument for patient evaluation of general practice care." I do not really understand what this comparison means, since you refer to another instrument where different or similar values have no meaning for the reliability values of the PTPSQ-I(15).

15) "This may be a reflection of cultural attitudes specific to Italians as Issa et al found..." this reference confirms the opposite finding compared to your paper. Issa et al. found that co-pay amount did not significantly affect patient satisfaction, while in your study you found a sig. relationship between payment and patient satisfaction with patients on co-payment showed the lowest satisfaction in the PTPSQ-I(15). Please explain your statement in the discussion or reformulate it that it is clear that you found the contrary results.
16) in table 1 and 7 I would say 'working' instead of worker, which can be easily misunderstood as blue or white collar workers, by contrast you want to distinguish here patients who are actually working or not as far as I understand
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