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Psychometric properties of the Patient Assessment of Chronic Illness Care measure: acceptability, reliability and validity in United Kingdom patients with long-term conditions

Jo Rick, Kelly Rowe, Mark Hann, Bonnie Sibbald, David Reeves, Martin Roland and Peter Bower

Your revised manuscript has now been assessed by the Associate Editor and his comments are provided below.

1. Please check the use of the term "levels of skew". Maybe "skewness levels" would be more appropriate? - Check fourth line on page 2, and also "problems of skew" on page 10 (last line); maybe "skewness problems"?

We have changed the reference in the abstract to ‘skewness levels’, and the reference on page 10 has been changed to ‘more symmetry’

2. On page 2, last line of the results. The last sentence needs a conclusion after the statement "scale developers did not fit the data."... What are the implications?

We have added the statement ‘reporting separate factor scores may not always be appropriate’.

3. On Page 11, last paragraph, third line- What are the implications for the statement "...the model did not fit the data well..." - What would be an acceptable level?
The acceptable levels of the various fit indices are actually presented in table 4, and we have drawn attention to this fact in the revision.

The model did not fit the data well according to most indices of fit (actual indices and conventional levels of ‘good’ fit are presented in Table 4).

We hope these changes are acceptable.

Best wishes,

Peter Bower