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In this article, the authors evaluated the internal construct validity of the Personal Care Participation Assessment and Resource Tool (PC-PART), which is a clinician-administered assessment designed to identify patients’ need in daily activities required for community life. The contribution and the quality of this article can be summarized as follows:

(1) The PC-PART posed by the authors is well defined and very interesting.
(2) The method used for the evaluation of the PC-PART is a chi-square statistical method which involves formal psychometric testing distribution. This method is appropriate for the evaluation of the PC-PART.
(3) There data in this article are sufficient and appropriate for the evaluation of the PC-PART.
(4) All the discussions in this research article are relevant for reporting and data deposition. The discussions and conclusions are well balanced and adequately supported by the data.
(5) The authors have acknowledged all the work (both published and unpublished) for which the paper has a strong relationship.
(6) The abstract accurately conveys the discoveries of this article.
(7) Both the English and the presentation of this paper are excellent.

However, this article consists of two minor errors, which are as follows:

(1) The sentence starting from line 39 should be “Data used in this research were taken from admission data …….”
(2) The sentence starting from line 79 should be “The distinction between …… may depend not only on the content of the items…….”

In view of the high quality of this article, I suggest that the paper should be
accepted for publication, subject to the correction of the minor errors listed above.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.