

**NURSING RESEARCH REVIEW FORM**

1st Review

**REVIEWER #2**

Manuscript #: 2006/010  
Manuscript title: Psychometric testing of the MOS social support survey on a Taiwanese sample  
Manuscript type: Regular  
Number of text pgs.: 15  
Number of figures: 0  
Number of tables: 11  
Reviewer: Karen Lyons  
Stat reviewer assigned?: No -- do you recommend a stat reviewer?

Please evaluate the following with these choices: (1) adequate, (2) inadequate (describe in written review) or (3) not appropriate (describe in written review)

Problem statement: 1  
Attention to relevant literature: 1  
Theoretical framework: 1  
Research design: 1  
Data analysis: 2  
Discussion of results: 1  
Organization: 1  
Writing style: 1

**Please rate the following topics 1-5 (with 5 being the highest rating):**

Value of topic: 3  
Probable reader interest in topic: 3  
Importance of present contribution to nursing: 4  
Priority of topic for publication: 3  
Rank this manuscript for its value: 3

**Reviewer's Recommendation (please type "X" after your choice):**

Accept without revisions  
Accept with revisions X  
Maybe accept with revisions  
Do not accept

**Comments for Editor only:**

**Please provide a comprehensive and integrated review of this manuscript.  
Be sure to present a balanced view of the manuscript's strengths and weaknesses.**

## Comment to Authors

Ms NUMBER: 2006/010

TITLE: Psychometric Testing of the MOS social support survey on a Taiwanese sample

The manuscript focuses on the psychometric properties of the MOS social support survey on an adult sample in Taiwan. The manuscript is well-written and well-organized; however, I have several concerns outlined below that I believe detract from the overall strength of the paper.

- On page 5, the authors discuss combining samples from two different studies to perform the data analysis (caregivers to persons with a hip-fracture and caregivers to persons with cancer). The authors do not discuss any of the issues or assumptions involved in combining these two samples. Such a combination only seems beneficial if the underlying factor structure can be assumed to be the same in each sample and no discussion of this is made. As the caregiving literature has shown some evidence that caring for someone with cancer can be more burdensome than someone with a physical impairment such as a hip fracture, I am not convinced that the factor structure would be the same in these two populations. Additionally, Table 1 shows significant differences between the two samples on age, marital status and education. As these variables have been linked to social support this also raises questions about the combination. The main rationale for the combination seems to be related to the variables used for criterion-related validity (one being available in each sample). This is not a strong argument for the combination and partitioning the sample for the validity analysis is also not very strong. I think the authors would be best advised to use just the 265 caregivers caring for someone with cancer. If they ran the factor analysis on these 265 and then wished to add in the 90 extra caregivers and found the same factor structure that would make a stronger case for the combination, but will still leave the problem of partitioning the sample in the validity analyses.
- The authors do a good job of describing the measures and previous work that has been done.
- I am unclear why both an exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis was performed on the same sample. This seems unconventional and inappropriate. I think the manuscript would be stronger if the authors chose one or the other based on their research question. It appears as though an exploratory factor analysis would be most appropriate for the goals of the paper. A confirmatory factor analysis could then be performed on a future sample to support the findings.
- I think the authors do a good job of describing the information in Table 2 so I think they could remove this table.
- In Table 3 it is not clear if the correlations are between the item and the subscale (including the item) or the corrected subscale (excluding the item). If the former, it is no surprise that the correlations are so high. Authors should clarify this and report the corrected correlations as this is more conventional and more informative.
- I was a little confused to see the reliability and validity of the 5 subscales reported before the factor analysis was done. Are these the 5 sub-scales in English or Taiwanese? If they are the Taiwanese, I think it would be better to wait and see what factors emerge in the factor analysis, before illustrating the reliability and validity. The authors do this later in the paper and it seems that is all that is needed, as the 5-factor solution does not hold up in the Taiwanese sample.
- In the exploratory factor analysis, 2 factors are extracted based on eigenvalues greater than 1. Did the authors look at other evidence for this decision e.g. scree plot, residual correlations?
- Table 10: are they corrected correlations?

- Related to the sample issue I raised above, I think the differences in criterion-related validity could be due to sample differences or differences in sample size. I think it would be better to simplify the issue and use only one sample.

I think the authors have done a nice job and social support is an important topic. The introduction and discussion were good and the rationale for the study was well presented. I think the paper could be simplified and strengthened by using only one sample and limiting the paper to an exploratory factor analysis.