

Oct 11, 2006

RE: NRES-D-06-00041, entitled "Effects of Acculturation on the Reporting of Depressive Symptoms among Hispanic Pregnant Women"

Dear Dr. Nguyen,

I am pleased to inform you that your paper has been found acceptable for publication pending minor revision. I anticipate that you will easily be able to answer the criticisms of the reviewers in a satisfactory manner. I will verify that this has been done upon receipt of the revised manuscript. Please find the comments of the reviewers listed below along with a checklist for style.

Please include with your revised submission an itemized, point-by-point response to the comments of the reviewers. The revisions should be completed by Jan 09, 2007 to avoid being considered as a new submission.

To submit a revision, go to <http://nres.edmgr.com/> and log in as an Author. You will see a menu item called "Submission Needing Revision." Please click on this item to obtain your submission record and begin the revision process.

With Kind Regards,

Molly C. Dougherty, PhD, RN, FAAN
Editor
Nursing Research

Reviewer Comments (there is no Reviewer #3):

Reviewer #1: This is an important study, and professionally reported. By the time I read the objectives I was excited to read more. I have a few substantive questions/comments to consider, and suggest careful editing for grammar and APA requirements for citations.

Substantive issues:

Either on Page 6, lines 7-8, or Page 7, line 5, I would like one-two sentences and more citations including perhaps Cuéllar who co-authored the ARMSA, to support using language preference as a proxy. While this is valid, it would be good to give wider support to the validity of this decision.

Page 7, starting line 4, I think a sentence or two about how the Spanish translation was developed would make the report of the study stronger. For example, were back-translation, testing for conceptual and language equivalence conducted? (as described by Phillips and colleagues in WJNR in 1996 and elsewhere).

Page 8, is DIF described/used by scientists other than Zumbo? Perhaps a few other citations.

Writing/organization:

The first sentence of the abstract is very long, might read better as two sentences.

P. 6, line 18, replace relationship with relation

P. 7, lines 2-3 and 7-11, sample results I believe should go under "Findings" rather than in the Methods section.

P. 10, line 12, needs to be changed because the study is looking at responses to questions; the participant is not making the association of symptoms with depressed mood, correct? Perhaps something like, "Hispanic does not report these symptoms as associated with depressed mood..."

Again, editing: I found several editing needs, for example, singular verbs associated with plural nouns, (eg p. 5, line 3).

Thank you for the opportunity.

Reviewer #2: This Brief Research Report assessed differences in responses to the CES-D between women who completed a Spanish version of the questionnaire compared to those who completed an English version. The author states that language preference is being used as a proxy measure for acculturation. The topic is very important given the frequency of proxy measures for acculturation in the literature, and the lack of documentation on translation methods and equivalence of instrument forms when two versions are used in a study. This manuscript could make a contribution demonstrating an acceptable method for assessing instruments that will be used in translated forms across cross cultural samples.

There are a few (fixable) problems with the manuscript, however. The manuscript title should include the term "language acculturation" since only that domain of acculturation is considered. A more serious problem is that, even considering the space limitations of a brief report, the manuscript does not introduce why acculturation is expected to contribute to depression in this population. In addition, a strong rationale is not articulated for conducting this study from a methodological or conceptual perspective. The articles reviewed deal with differences in depression by country of birth and length of time in the host country, both of which are frequently used proxies for acculturation--but none of the background articles explain why language as a proxy for acculturation is chosen. Perhaps this study really examines cultural differences or simply language preference, since a strong rationale for equating language preference with acculturation status is not really presented. The second paragraph on p. 5 (lines 4-9) is not clear in its relationship to the topic at hand. Finally, the author makes a case that the language or translation may affect the way words are interpreted, but then does not relate that to

acculturation, which is the apparent purpose of the study. In general, the acculturation and translation issues are not differentiated or clarified as part of the problem statement so the rationale for this study remains a bit murky.

In summary, the goal of the article is to examine differences in performance on the CES-D between women who choose to take it in Spanish or English. But a secondary point is establishing conceptual equivalence or validity in the two versions. This measurement issue is not discussed but is in fact an important methodological component of the paper. How do we know that the differences between the two groups were due to acculturation vs. translation, and how might we be able to do so? How might one follow up on this study to make better judgments regarding the adequacy of translations in general or the issue of allowing participants to choose the language in which they take questionnaires without creating a biased sample? More sophisticated interpretation in terms of the measurement issues raised by this study would be useful and make more of a contribution to cross-cultural research.

Reviewer #4: Re: "Effects of Acculturation on the Responding of Depressive Symptoms among Hispanic Pregnant Women"

Purpose

This study investigated whether acculturation influences the responses to symptoms items and the total scale score of CESD in Hispanic pregnant women. Acculturation was measured by subjects' language preference.

Background

The background about the differences in depression between Mexican descent born in the US and Mexican immigrants was clear. But there wasn't enough information about issues of using CESD in the Hispanic population. The rationale for studying instrument validity when translated into another language was sufficient.

DIF is a new method developed by researchers in the education field to study item bias and an instrument's validity. It has not been widely used in nursing. Thus more detailed description of the method is needed. I found the description of the method confusing on page 6. The analogy from education to mental health field did not logically flow. For instance, the DIF in education is based on the assumption that test takers who have similar knowledge (based on total test scores) would perform similarly on individual test items regardless of their characteristics such as sex and ethnicity. Translating this assumption into this study, it meant that subjects with similar depression status (based on total score) should perform in similar way on individual items of CESD regardless of their language preferences. But in the manuscript, the authors related the item response to a person's conceptualization or knowledge of depression. I am not clear how the authors deducted that relation from the education theory.

Methods

There was not enough detail of the study methods. What were the inclusion criteria? Was the

data collected by personal interview or paper-pencil method? If paper-pencil, were all women able to read and understand either English or Spanish? How many clinics were involved in recruiting subjects and who collected the data?

I understand that the language preference could be used to measure acculturation. But there were other significant differences between the two groups of women (table 1) that could also explain the differences in CESD scores other than acculturation, such as length of stay in the US and education. Actually, all demographic variables reported in the manuscript were different between the two groups of women. Given these differences, it is difficult to claim that the differences in DIF were due to language preference unless all other confounding variables were also controlled.

For the measure of CESD, who translated the questionnaire and what measures were used to ensure the accurate translation? Was higher score indicating higher depression?

For statistical analysis, Zumbo (1999) suggested using $\alpha=0.01$ as the significance level to control for the multiple tests. Here I suggest the authors to do the same. With 20 tests to perform at each analysis, using $p<0.05$ would inflate type I error too much.

Findings

Although both uniform and interaction model (model II and III) were mentioned in the analysis section, there was no mention of model III in the finding section. Thus it is not clear whether there was an interaction between language preference and total score.

R-squared was used to measure effect size. Again, Zumbo (1999) suggested that $R^2=0.13$ or 13% as the indication of reasonable effect size. In this study, none of the R^2 reached 13. This should be mentioned in the result section. The chi-square change might be significant, but the effect size was small to medium.

There was a typo in table 3 in the column of R^2 .

Discussion and implications

In the discussion, I think "impact" or "influence" should be replaced with "related" because there were too many extraneous variables to the observed relationships thus it did not warrant causal inferences.

Summary

This is a study using DIF to test the validity of CESD in a group of Hispanic women. Applying this method in mental health situation is innovative and appropriate. This method offers opportunities for psychometric tests, especially in the instrument development stage. Since this method is relatively new to nursing, more detailed description is needed to understand the findings. There were multiple weaknesses in the method section that weaken the quality of this study.

CHECKLIST FOR STYLE

Title Page

-- Supply affiliation and professional title for each author.

References

Update in-text citations using APA 5th Ed. Format (The Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, 5th Edition, pp. 208-209). In particular:

-- On first citation of a reference, list all authors if there are less than 6. For following citations, use first author followed by et al. (i.e., Escobar...)

-- The following references are not cited in the text. Remove from reference list or add to text.

(a) Nicholson... (2006)

(b) SAS Institute (2002-2003)

Tables

-- Define all abbreviations used in table(s) in a note below each table.

-- Table 4: What does the superscript 1 mean? Please add a note if it remains.