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Author’s response to reviews:

Isadora Orlando de Oliveira, Pt, MSc (Reviewer 1):

We has considered your observations and reviewed the suggested documents

Reviewer 2

Some publications discuss about the appropriate sample size for a factor analysis. For this study the sample size was from 45 - 180. In the Sample and Procedure section we added a paragraph indicating the sample size calculation.


Suhr DD. Exploratory or Confirmatory Factor Analysis? SAS Inst Cary. 2006;17


The EFA as CFA uses the "common factors model"; proposing a set of indicators influenced by one or more main latent factors. This means that the model is a causal model, in which the factor
represents some empirical, one-dimensional entity, independent of the measurement procedure and the correlations between the indicators.

In our work, we do not try to discover the "dimensionality of the indicators", but we want a) verify that the factors really represent an existing entity according to the other validation works carried out and b) if the causal effects assumed (that is, the factor loads) are specified correctly. With this, we recognize that when there a sufficient theoretical basis, both EFA and CFA, in this case, the different validations cited in the manuscript, could be used to test the same data. The model was based on a combination of prior theory. It was verified with an EFC to verify the structure and the CFA was carried out.

However, we will consider your all comments for future works.

Reviewer 3

Major Concerns:

1) We added a paragraph in the Method section, Sample and Procedure subsection, page 4. Here we mention the sample size and how we reached it.

2) The participants answer all the questions of the SDM-Q-9. In Result section, page 5, was added this information.

3) The procedure done at that point is support in Sperber's work. In the Method section, Translation subsection, page 3 is specify that the score scale is according to Sperber. Also, we mention the mid-value (4 (moderate comparable/moderate similar).

Minor concerns:

Our manuscript has been reviewed by a native speaker colleague.

Details

Abstract:

1) The change has been done as you suggest

2) We apologize for this error, we have corrected the text as you suggested.
Background:

3) We have change the texting referencing to square brackets

4) The manuscript was reviewed by a colleague

5) The text was corrected as you suggest.

4,6,7) The manuscript was revised by a native speaker colleague and corrections were made.

Translation

8) The text was corrected as you suggest

9) The procedure done at that point is support in Sperber's work. In the Method section, Translation subsection, page 3 is specify that the score scale is according to Sperber. Also, we mention the mid-value (4 (moderate comparable/moderate similar).

Sample and Procedure

10) We added a paragraph in the Method section, Sample and Procedure subsection, page 4. Here we mention the sample size and how we reached it.

11) Completing the socio-demographic questionnaire before consultation was to optimize time. This was added at Sample and Procedure, paragraph 3, page 4

12) The participants answer all the questions of the SDM-Q-9. In Result section, page 5, was added this information.

13) The SDM-Q-9 was a face-to-face interview. This was added in the third paragraph in Sample and Procedure section, page 4.

14) We apologize for this error, we edit the text to make clear we refer to "variables with normal distribution"

Results

16) We apologize for this error, we have corrected it

18-20) We have made the corrections you suggest and it was revised by a colleague.