



Dear Sherry,

Attached please find my revised manuscript entitled: Use of Situation-Specific Norbeck Social Support Questionnaire items. I have addressed each of the four reviewers' suggestions as follows:

1. Reviewer 1's suggestions (highlighted in yellow):
 - Grammatical revisions were completed as suggested. ✓
 - It was made clear (page 5) that the NSSQ was based on Kahn's ✓ conceptualization of social support not merely his definition. His conceptualization was provided.
 - It was made clear (page 7) how the situation-specific items for the present ✓ study were developed and why the remaining 3 items were not used.
 - "proposed" (page 9) was added in the interest of space saving. I believe it is clear now that the proposed model refers to the top of page 8 where the full model is laid out.
 - On page 10 a more detailed explanation of what was meant by a "poor fit" was provided.
2. Reviewer 2's suggestions ([redacted]):
 - On page 5 an explanation of plans to evaluate the properties of the revised NSSQ is provided.
 - On page 8 (method) response rate was clarified.
3. Reviewer 3's suggestions ([redacted]):
 - Please see reviewer 1's suggestion (in yellow) on page 7 concerning how the situation-specific items were developed.
 - On page 5 it is stated that this was a factor analysis (for design). I did not use the term confirmatory factor analysis because this study was not done in the true sense of confirming hypotheses and no hypotheses are stated.
 - On page 5 ([redacted]) the pilot study is now briefly described.
 - On page 10 the Critical N for this study is now given. This is the appropriate "power analysis" for this type of study. Unlike most studies, the *less* participants you have the easier it is for the model to be accepted. In this case only if the sample size was more than halved would the model be accepted. Thus sample size was adequate. Root Mean Square Error of Approximation was also added as an extra check.
 - On page 11 the discussion concerning the low scores of SSAid and SSAfirm was reworded to aid clarity.
4. Reviewer 4's suggestions ([redacted]):
 - The factor analysis provides evidence of construct validity. Reliability is now addressed on page 11 (Cronbach's alpha). Only reliability for the 3 item scale can be presented because one needs at least two items in each scale to test reliability. In this case each factor had only one item. Thus the reliability for the full three item scale is presented.

- Page 4 MSRS is now defined in this section.
- The suggestion to reverse the Procedure and Sample sections was tried but I believe the readability suffers and they were left as is.
- The reliability and validity of the NSSQ was presented in the 2002 work and because this was a "Brief" it was not presented again
- The suggested sample characteristics were added (pages 8 and 9)
- On page 10, reasons for testing the proposed model are made clearer.
- An alternate model was tested as suggested. That is, on page 12 results of an additional one factor model (Situation-Specific Support) are presented.
- Statistical text was changed as suggested
- The added reliability analysis and alternate model inclusion now provide justification for the recommendations (page 13).
- The justification for the phrase "will serve to decrease response rate" was clarified (page 13)
- Tables 1 and 2 were corrected to avoid run off

Checklist items were fixed as indicated. Please note that in the figure I indicated SSAffect etc in place of SSAffect2 because the LISREL program will not accept more than 8 characters and I did not want to leave out a letter.

✓ Finally, I received renewed permission from Lippincott Williams & Wilkins to use Table 1 from Jane Norbeck's original article (1981). I am sending this renewed permission along with my correspondence to them and the original permissions I received (Norbeck and LWW) for the 2002 article in Nursing Research.

Please let me know if you do not get the highlighting in the copy I am sending. I think this will work fine though.

Thank you for your consideration, I look forward to your response.

Eileen Gigliotti RN; PhD
 Associate Professor
 CUNY/ College of Staten Island
 Department of Nursing
 2800 Victory Blvd
 Staten Island NY 10314