

#### 4. Judul Artikel: Translation, Adaptation and Psychometric Validation of the Indonesian Version of the Readiness for Hospital Discharge Scale for Parents of Low Birth Weight Infants,

Jurnal bereputasi (Scopus Q1)

Peran: penulis pertama dan penulis korespondensi

#### Komentar dari Reviewer :

*Bukti korespondensi belum mencantumkan daftar komentar reviewer dan respon penulis secara adekuat. Mohon diperbaiki.*

The screenshot shows a Gmail interface with a search bar containing "Readiness for Hospital Discharge Scale for Parents of Low Birth Weight Infants". The main email is titled "Reviews complete and decision pending for your manuscript JPEDIATRNURS\_2019\_563" and is from "Journal of Pediatric Nursing". The email body contains the following text:

Reference: JPEDIATRNURS\_2019\_563  
Title: Translation, adaptation and psychometric validation of the Indonesian version of the Readiness for Hospital Discharge Scale for parents of low birth weight infants  
Journal: Journal of Pediatric Nursing

Dear Ms. Hariati,

I am pleased to inform you that I have received all the required reviews, which I will now evaluate before making a decision on your manuscript referenced above.

In the event that I need to seek the opinion of an additional reviewer, you may see the status of your manuscript revert briefly from 'Ready for Decision' to 'Under Review'.

To track the status of your manuscript, please log into EVISE® [http://www.evise.com/evise/faces/pages/navigation/NavController.jspx?JRNL\\_ACR=JPEDIATRNURS](http://www.evise.com/evise/faces/pages/navigation/NavController.jspx?JRNL_ACR=JPEDIATRNURS) and go to 'My Submissions'.

I will inform you once I have made a decision.

Thank you again for submitting your manuscript to Journal of Pediatric Nursing and for giving me the opportunity to consider your work.

Kind regards,  
Journal of Pediatric Nursing

**Have questions or need assistance?**  
For further assistance, please visit our [Customer Support](#) site. Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions, and learn more about EVISE® via interactive tutorials. You can also talk 24/7 to our customer support team by phone and 24/7 by live chat and email.

Copyright © 2018 Elsevier B.V. | [Privacy Policy](#)  
Elsevier B.V., Radarweg 29, 1043 NX Amsterdam, The Netherlands, Reg. No. 33156677.

The screenshot also shows a second email from the same sender, dated "Tue, Dec 31, 2019, 10:09 AM", which is partially visible at the bottom.

Decision on your submission to Journal of Pediatric Nursing

Cecily Betz (Journal of Pediatric Nursing) [EviseSupport@elsevier.com](mailto:EviseSupport@elsevier.com) via [eu-west-1-amazonSES.com](mailto:eu-west-1-amazonSES.com)  
 to me

Ref: JPEDIATRNURS\_2019\_563  
 Title: **Translation, adaptation and psychometric validation of the Indonesian version of the Readiness for Hospital Discharge Scale for parents of low birth weight infants**  
 Journal: Journal of Pediatric Nursing

Dear Ms. Hariati,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Journal of Pediatric Nursing.

I have completed my evaluation of your manuscript. The reviewers recommend reconsideration of your manuscript following revision. I invite you to resubmit your manuscript after addressing the comments below.

When revising your manuscript, please consider all issues mentioned in the reviewers' comments carefully; please outline in a cover letter every change made in response to their comments and provide suitable rebuttals for any comments not addressed. Please note that your revised submission may need to be re-reviewed.

If you would like to revise your manuscript, you first need to accept this invitation:

- Log into EVISEe at: [http://www.elsevier.com/elsevier/faces/pages/navigation/NavController.jspx?JRNL\\_ACR=JPEDIATRNURS](http://www.elsevier.com/elsevier/faces/pages/navigation/NavController.jspx?JRNL_ACR=JPEDIATRNURS)
- Locate your manuscript under the header 'My Submissions that need Revisions' on your 'My Author Tasks' view; and
- Click on 'Agree to Revise'.

Upon agreeing to revise your manuscript, your revision deadline will be displayed in your 'My Author Tasks' view.

When you are ready, please submit your revision by logging into EVISEe at: [http://www.elsevier.com/elsevier/faces/pages/navigation/NavController.jspx?JRNL\\_ACR=JPEDIATRNURS](http://www.elsevier.com/elsevier/faces/pages/navigation/NavController.jspx?JRNL_ACR=JPEDIATRNURS)

Journal of Pediatric Nursing values your contribution and I look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.

Kind regards,  
 Cecily L. Betz, PhD, RN, FAAN  
 Editor-in-Chief  
 Journal of Pediatric Nursing

**Editor and Reviewer Comments:**  
 -Editor

Thank you for submitting your article on the **Translation, Adaptation, and Psychometric Validation of the Indonesian Version of the Readiness for Hospital Discharge Scale for Parents of Low Birth Weight Infants** to the Journal of Pediatric Nursing in consideration for publication. This study aimed to undertake cross-cultural adaptation and psychometric validation of the original version (English) of the RHDS-Parent Form into Bahasa Indonesia. Because the preparation for discharge is a universal healthcare requirement, translation of useful instruments is important culturally. Note that reviewers have identified significant concerns with the manuscript which would require significant revision and rewriting to redo some analyses, conduct additional analyses, and revise the methods, including sample size estimate and description of setting, and results sections. Were any changes made in the revised tool for this study? The Abstract format must fit the guidelines identified in the author guidelines. The headings and subheadings in the text must be in APA style. If you decide to revise, English grammar and style needs to be reviewed by an English writing expert.

Received revision JPEDIATRNURS\_2019\_563\_R1

Journal of Pediatric Nursing [EviseSupport@elsevier.com](mailto:EviseSupport@elsevier.com) via [eu-west-1-amazonSES.com](mailto:eu-west-1-amazonSES.com)  
 to me

This message was sent automatically.

Ref: JPEDIATRNURS\_2019\_563\_R1  
 Title: **Translation, adaptation and psychometric validation of the Indonesian version of the Readiness for Hospital Discharge Scale for parents of low birth weight infants**  
 Journal: Journal of Pediatric Nursing

Dear Ms. Hariati,

Thank you for submitting your revised manuscript for consideration for publication in Journal of Pediatric Nursing. Your revision was received in good order.

To track the status of your manuscript, please log into EVISEe [http://www.elsevier.com/elsevier/faces/pages/navigation/NavController.jspx?JRNL\\_ACR=JPEDIATRNURS](http://www.elsevier.com/elsevier/faces/pages/navigation/NavController.jspx?JRNL_ACR=JPEDIATRNURS) and locate the submission under the header 'My Submissions with Journal' on your 'My Author Tasks' view.

We appreciate your submitting your revision to this journal.

Kind regards,  
 Journal of Pediatric Nursing

**Have questions or need assistance?**  
 For further assistance, please visit our [Customer Support](#) site. Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions, and learn more about EVISEe via interactive tutorials. You can also talk 24/5 to our customer support team by phone and 24/7 by live chat and email.

Copyright © 2018 Elsevier B.V. | [Privacy Policy](#)  
 Elsevier B.V., Radarweg 29, 1043 NX Amsterdam, The Netherlands, Reg. No. 33156677.

...

[Message clipped] [View entire message](#)

Reply Forward

Decision on your submission to Journal of Pediatric Nursing

Cecily Betz (Journal of Pediatric Nursing) [EviseSupport@elsevier.com](mailto:EviseSupport@elsevier.com) via [amazon.com](https://www.amazon.com)

Ref: JPEDIATRNURS\_2019\_563\_R1  
 Title: **Translation, adaptation and psychometric validation of the Indonesian version of the Readiness for Hospital Discharge Scale for parents of low birth weight infants**  
 Journal: Journal of Pediatric Nursing

Dear Ms. Hariati,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Journal of Pediatric Nursing.

I have completed my evaluation of your manuscript. The reviewers recommend reconsideration of your manuscript following revision. I invite you to resubmit your manuscript after addressing the comments below.

When revising your manuscript, please consider all issues mentioned in the reviewers' comments carefully; please outline in a cover letter every change made in response to their comments and provide suitable rebuttals for any comments not addressed. Please note that your revised submission may need to be re-reviewed.

If you would like to revise your manuscript, you first need to accept this invitation:

- Log into EVISEe at: [http://www.elsevier.com/elsevier/faces/pages/navigation/NavController.jspx?JRNLI\\_ACR=JPEDIATRNURS](http://www.elsevier.com/elsevier/faces/pages/navigation/NavController.jspx?JRNLI_ACR=JPEDIATRNURS)
- Locate your manuscript under the header 'My Submissions that need Revisions' on your 'My Author Tasks' view; and
- Click on 'Agree to Revise'.

Upon agreeing to revise your manuscript, your revision deadline will be displayed in your 'My Author Tasks' view.

When you are ready, please submit your revision by logging into EVISEe at: [http://www.elsevier.com/elsevier/faces/pages/navigation/NavController.jspx?JRNLI\\_ACR=JPEDIATRNURS](http://www.elsevier.com/elsevier/faces/pages/navigation/NavController.jspx?JRNLI_ACR=JPEDIATRNURS)

Journal of Pediatric Nursing values your contribution and I look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.

Kind regards,  
 Cecily L. Betz, PhD, RN, FAAN  
 Editor-in-Chief  
 Journal of Pediatric Nursing

**Editor and Reviewer Comments:**  
 -Editor  
 - Additional revisions are required. Also, review and revision by an English writing expert is required before consideration for publication.

**-Reviewer 1**  
 -

The authors have addressed most of my comments. However, for one of my previous comments on Table 2, I meant the author should present all the factor loadings for each item across the four factors. Now, we could only see the 29 loadings but it would be better to show all 116 loadings so that the readers can know the items selection process.

Received revision JPEDIATRNURS\_2019\_563\_R2

Journal of Pediatric Nursing [EviseSupport@elsevier.com](mailto:EviseSupport@elsevier.com) via [amazon.com](https://www.amazon.com)

Ref: JPEDIATRNURS\_2019\_563\_R2  
 Title: **Translation, adaptation and psychometric validation of the Indonesian version of the Readiness for Hospital Discharge Scale for parents of low birth weight infants**  
 Journal: Journal of Pediatric Nursing

Dear Ms. Hariati,

This message was sent automatically.

Thank you for submitting your revised manuscript for consideration for publication in Journal of Pediatric Nursing. Your revision was received in good order.

To track the status of your manuscript, please log into EVISEe [http://www.elsevier.com/elsevier/faces/pages/navigation/NavController.jspx?JRNLI\\_ACR=JPEDIATRNURS](http://www.elsevier.com/elsevier/faces/pages/navigation/NavController.jspx?JRNLI_ACR=JPEDIATRNURS) and locate the submission under the header 'My Submissions with Journal' on your 'My Author Tasks' view.

We appreciate your submitting your revision to this journal.

Kind regards,  
 Journal of Pediatric Nursing

**Have questions or need assistance?**  
 For further assistance, please visit our [Customer Support](https://www.elsevier.com/elsevier/customer-support) site. Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions, and learn more about EVISEe via interactive tutorials. You can also talk 24/5 to our customer support team by phone and 24/7 by live chat and email.

Copyright © 2018 Elsevier B.V. | [Privacy Policy](https://www.elsevier.com/elsevier/privacy-policy)  
 Elsevier B.V., Radanweg 29, 1043 NX Amsterdam, The Netherlands, Reg. No. 33156677.

...

[Message clipped] [View entire message](#)

Reply Forward

Revision requested for JPEDIATR NURS\_2019\_563\_R3

Cecily Betz (Journal of Pediatric Nursing) <Evisesupport@elsevier.com>  
to me

Sun, May 17, 2020, 12:50 AM

Ref: JPEDIATR NURS\_2019\_563\_R3  
Title: **Translation, adaptation and psychometric validation of the Indonesian version of the Readiness for Hospital Discharge Scale for parents of low birth weight infants**  
Journal: Journal of Pediatric Nursing

Dear Ms. Hariati,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Journal of Pediatric Nursing. I have received comments from reviewers on your manuscript. Your paper should become acceptable for publication pending suitable minor revision and modification of the article in light of the appended reviewer comments.

When resubmitting your manuscript, please carefully consider all issues mentioned in the reviewers' comments, outline every change made point by point, and provide suitable rebuttals for any comments not addressed.

To submit your revised manuscript:

- Log into EVISE at: [http://www.evises.com/evises/faces/aces/navigation/NavController.jspx?\\_afz=JPEDIATR NURS](http://www.evises.com/evises/faces/aces/navigation/NavController.jspx?_afz=JPEDIATR NURS)
- Locate your manuscript under the header 'My Submissions that need Revisions' on your 'My Author Tasks' view
- Click on 'Agree to Revisit'
- Make the required edits
- Click on 'Complete Submission' to approve

**What happens next?**

After you approve your submission preview you will receive a notification that the submission is complete. To track the status of your paper throughout the editorial process, log in to EVISE at: [http://www.evises.com/evises/faces/aces/navigation/NavController.jspx?\\_afz=JPEDIATR NURS](http://www.evises.com/evises/faces/aces/navigation/NavController.jspx?_afz=JPEDIATR NURS)

**Enrich your article to present your research with maximum impact.** This journal supports the following [Content Innovations](#)

I look forward to receiving your revised manuscript as soon as possible.

Kind regards,  
Cecily L. Betz, PhD, RN, FAAN  
Editor-in-Chief  
Journal of Pediatric Nursing

**Comments from the editor:**

Change: many preterm have lower Apgar scores TO: many preterm **infants** have lower Apgar scores  
Is there a full title for this acronym? If so, it should be spelled out first: RHDS-Parent  
The term enumerators is not used in US journals; what is the meaning of enumerators? Do you mean data collectors?  
This can be deleted: on 14 May 2018

Your manuscript JPEDIATR NURS\_2019\_563\_R4 has been accepted

Cecily Betz (Journal of Pediatric Nursing) <Evisesupport@elsevier.com>  
to me

Mon, May 18, 2020, 4:26 AM

Ref: JPEDIATR NURS\_2019\_563\_R4  
Title: **Translation, adaptation and psychometric validation of the Indonesian version of the Readiness for Hospital Discharge Scale for parents of low birth weight infants**  
Journal: Journal of Pediatric Nursing

Dear Ms. Hariati,

I am pleased to inform you that your paper has been accepted for publication. My own comments as well as any reviewer comments are appended to the end of this letter. Now that your manuscript has completed the submission process, it will proceed to copy editing and production.

When you receive author proofs please carefully review the order of authors, their credentials, position titles and affiliations. Once you have approved the proofs no further changes can be made.

Please note that the journal retains copyright (unless you have chosen the open access option), and we ask authors not to post published journal articles on publicly accessible sites. You are welcome to include the abstract and a link to the article from the journal website. You may see our full posting policy [here](#) and our scholarly sharing policy [here](#).

Thank you for submitting your work to Journal of Pediatric Nursing. We hope you consider us again for future submissions.

Kind regards,  
Cecily L. Betz, PhD, RN, FAAN  
Editor-in-Chief  
Journal of Pediatric Nursing

**Comments from the editors and reviewers:**

**Have questions or need assistance?**  
For further assistance, please visit our [Customer Support](#) site. Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions, and learn more about EVISE via interactive tutorials. You can also talk 24/5 to our customer support team by phone and 24/7 by live chat and email.

Copyright © 2018 Elsevier B.V. | [Privacy Policy](#)  
Elsevier B.V., Radanweg 29, 1043 NX Amsterdam, The Netherlands, Reg. No. 33156677.

sun hariati, S.kep, Ns, M.kep <sunhariati@unhas.ac.id>  
to cbez

Tue, May 19, 2020, 12:56 PM

Dear  
Cecily L. Betz, PhD, RN, FAAN  
Editor-in-Chief  
Journal of Pediatric Nursing

## REVIEW PERTAMA

### Response to Reviewers

Dear Reviewers

Thank you for your comments on our paper. We have attempted to address each one and believe the paper is stronger as a result.

Reviewer 1

Comment	Response
The authors tried to translate a validated scale (Readiness for Hospital Discharge Scale) into Indonesian and validate it. I think the topic is interesting but the authors may need to clarify some points for the methods and results section listed below.	Thank you for your comment. We have amended a number of points around the method and results based on your suggestions.
<b>Methods</b>	
Where the mothers were recruited from? Pediatric ward of a public hospital? In which province of Indonesia?	We have added information about setting of this study in line 209 - 218 Section participant and setting.
It is quite common that this section is called Participants and Setting, so you can move some of the information in Data Collection subsection to this subsection	Thank you for your suggestion. We have refined the name with participants and setting as suggested in line 207
"...minimum subject to item ratio of at least 5:1..." is for computing Cronbach's alpha or factor analysis?	The item ratio was used for factor analysis. We have added information in line 226 - 232 Subsection participant and setting.
Instruments subsection Authors had summarized the reliability of the scale (through Cronbach's alpha) but whether any reports about the (construct) validity of the scale?	We have added explanation about the RHDS construct validity in previous psychometric study in instruments subsection line 291 – 308.
Translation subsection Step 2: I suppose the independent translator was different from the 3 translator in Step 1?	We used a different independent translator in step 2. We have added explanation and numbered the translators (TL1, TL2, TL3, TL4, & TL 5) to indicate them. In line 352-355
Step 3: Again the translator was different from those in previous steps? Please clarify or use TL4 & TL5 to indicate them.	Thank you for your suggestion. We used a different translator in this step. We have explained the characteristics of different translators in step 1 in line 376
Step 5: What were the two dichotomous questions? I am not sure whether this step is considered as face or content validation? For content validation, experts are usually involved and CVI would be computed. For face validity, CVI are not commonly computed (but I think it is nothing wrong).	Thank you for this oversight. The respondents asked to rate the instructions, response and 29 items of RHDS instrument using a dichotomous scale (clear and unclear) that We have revised in line 406 – 412,  This step is considered as face validity and the I-CVI that we mentioned before replaced

	<p>with inter-rater agreement among the sample. We have revised in line 426 - 434</p> <p>We are sorry due to confused about the term of this stage.</p>
<p>Step 6: I think it is the content validation, please state clear if there was only one item with I-CVI &lt;0.8.</p>	<p>Yes, this is content validity. We have added information in line 438 - 443</p>
<p>Data collection subsection It was mentioned "...Data collection was carried out between June and December 2018 by the first author..." but then "The data was collected by enumerators who were NICU nurses in each hospital. Enumerators were carefully trained before collecting data."....So who did actually recruit the mothers and collect the data?</p>	<p>The mothers were recruited by the first author and enumerators. The first author recruited in one hospital and the other six hospitals were recruited by enumerators. We have added this information in line 575 - 584</p>
<p>Data analysis subsection It was mentioned "Absolute and relative frequencies were used to describe qualitative variables" ...did it mean Frequencies and Percentages?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment, we have considered it and replaced the term in line 496 Subsection step 7 (A)</p>
<p>It was mentioned "averages and standard deviations (SD) were used to describe quantitative variables" usually we used the word "mean" instead of "average".</p>	<p>Thank you for your suggestion. We have changed the term in line 498 Subsection step 7 (A)</p>
<p>"Exploratory factor analysis was conducted to explore construct validity" I think EFA is used to explore the factor structure which may then be linked to the construct validity.</p>	<p>Thank you for this oversight. We have read again the theory and have changed the explanation as a suggested in line 511-513 Subsection step 7 (B)</p>
<p>Basically KMO statistic and Bartlett's were used to examine the assumption in using EFA. In your case, it meant that your data were suitable for conducting EFA.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. We have revised the sentence as a suggested in line 513 - 515 Subsection step 7 (B)</p>
<p>Please state which criteria was/were used in deciding the number of factors for the EFA? (Eigenvalue &gt;1 rule or scree plot or parallel analysis?)</p>	<p>Thank you for your valuable inputs. We have added this subsection with criteria of EFA that we have explained in line 516 - 522 Subsection step 7 (B)</p>
<p>It was mentioned "The factor loading for each item that matched with the sample size in this study was &gt;0.45 (total sample=146)"....I think the cut-off value was decided by the investigators, usually 0.4 or above. Did you want to say the threshold value for the factor loadings was 0.45 ?</p>	<p>This decision was based on one book about multivariate data analysis (Hair, Black, Babin, &amp; Anderson, 2013) that explains guidelines for identifying significant factor loadings based on sample size for EFAs. For example, in a sample of 100 respondents, factor loadings of .55 and above are considered significant. For this research with 146 respondents, factor</p>

	<p>loading of 0.45 and above are considered significant.</p> <p>We have revised the sentence for flow in line 530 - 535</p> <p>Subsection step 7 (B)</p>
<p>When the authors described the Confirmatory Factor Analysis, please state clear which factor structure was examined (I assume it should be the original structure reported in the literature?)</p>	<p>We described the CFA used previous factor structure from EFA. We have revised the sentence in line 507 - 511</p> <p>We added the explanation of the use of EFA before CFA in this study based on recommendation by Sousa and Rojjanasrirat (2010) and previous research Xu.et.al. (2019) in line 535 - 546</p> <p>Subsection step 7 (B)</p>
<b>Results section</b>	
<p>Table 1: I think it is better to use 1 decimal place for all the numbers (except p-values) but please check the journal requirement</p>	<p>Thank you for your helpful inputs. We have added the information based on all reviewer inputs in Table 1.</p>
<p>Table 2: For completeness, would it be better to show the factor loadings of each item for all the factors? Simply bold those &gt;0.45 would do....then readers could have a better idea how you selected.</p>	<p>Thank you for your suggestion. We have changed the table based on your recommendation in Table 2</p>
<p>I seldom see others use eigenvalue &gt;2 as cut-off ...any reference to support the choice?</p>	<p>Thank you for identifying this oversight. In this sentence. We explained the eigenvalue from the data analysis. We have changed the sentence for flow in line 695</p>
<p>It was mentioned "According to the EFA result, four items were deleted because of either lower loading than 0.45 (Items 5b, 12 and 21) and crossover loading lower than 0.15 (item 8a)."</p>	<p>We have deleted this sentence as we undertook some refined analysis and have amended results as a result of this suggestion.</p>
<p>My understanding is the aim of the study is to translate the scale into a new language, so I would simply report the factor structure obtained from EFA (it should be more than 5 factors as the smallest eigenvalue of the five factors was 2.2) and then compare narratively with the original factor structure. Afterwards, I might use Confirmatory Factor Analysis to check if the data from the 29 items fit the factor structure of the original scale (which should be the last model of Table 3).</p>	<p>Thank you for the helpful input in this section. We have performed a revised analysis and explained the results again as suggested in section results</p>
<p>It was mentioned "Consideration for deleting four items (6, 7b, 8b, and 19) was based on content of each factor. Four items, 6, 7b, 8b and 19, had good factor loading but different content with most</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. We used the same sample for EFA and CFA because bed numbers and capacity in each hospital are limited, when compared with the number of LBW infants. The other reason is this scale measured one day before hospital discharge,</p>

<p>items in the factor and compared to the original component."</p> <p>In fact, these four items had relatively low factor loadings in the EFA, their factor loadings were 0.575, 0.460, 0.527 and 0.526 respectively (see Table 2). After removing them, the lowest factor loadings in the EFA would become 0.550? So of course, it will fit better in the CFA as it was a better factor structure created using the collected data. In short, it is not appropriate to use the same data to explore the factor structure and then confirm the structure.</p>	<p>while many LBW infants died in early days after admission. Hence, it was difficult to find a sufficiently large sample.</p> <p>We have indicated using the same sample for EFA and CFA in subsection step 7 (B) line 543 - 546</p> <p>We have also stated this problem in our study limitations and recommended further study to access a larger sample as suggested by reviewer 2</p>
<p>I have the following suggestion, not sure if it is helpful but the authors can consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Present the results of EFA using all the 29 items through a more commonly used factor-extraction rule (like eigen-value &gt;1, scree plot, parallel analysis, etc.), it may have more than 5 or even 7 factors but it doesn't matter as different population may react differently across the items.</li> </ol>	<p>Thank you very much for your suggestion. This suggestion helped us to resolve the data analysis problem. We have read several references and found that your suggestion is similar with the references we have read. We have revised our analysis of construct validity as per your suggestion. Our steps were:</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Then the authors can conduct CFA to examine if the data fit one or more previously reported structures. (Model 3 in Table 3 should be one of the structures)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Used EFA for extracting the factor structure by using extraction rule; eigenvalue &gt;1, maximum likelihood extraction with oblique rotation (we have stated this in subsection step 7 (B))</li> </ol>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. If the authors want to remove a few items, they can check the item-total correlation or Cronbach's alpha when item is removed to see which item(s) are quite different from other items. Then, they can re-conduct the EFA to propose a better factor structure (but this one may not be able to confirm).</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The EFA identified four factor structure and the results are described in Table 2</li> <li>3. We used criteria factor loading coefficients <math>\leq 0.45</math> for deleting items as recommended by references. (we have stated this in subsection step 7 (B))</li> <li>4. We have bolded all items <math>&gt; .45</math> as the suggestion reviewer (table 2)</li> <li>5. Then we conducted CFA to verify the factor structure acquired from EFA and we also conducted CFA using original factor structure for determining the best fit model (table 3)</li> </ol>
<p>Remark: For validating a new scale, one way is to collect at least double of the required sample size and then divide the sample into two sub-samples, one sub-sample is used to explore the structure (i.e. conduct EFA, item total correction, etc., to get a better structure) and then confirm the structure using another sub-sample.</p>	<p>Thank you for your consideration. We have listed this problem in our limitations in subsection limitation.</p>

Reviewer 2

Comment	Response
<p>This paper is well written in presenting the cross cultural adaptation of a measure of parental readiness for discharge of Low birthweight babies. It points out that readiness for discharge is an important concept globally and instrument validation in new populations is important for clinical care to advance worldwide.</p>	<p>Thank you very much for your comments</p>
<p>The translation/adaptation process is presented in detail using an established method. The detail will be helpful to others who undertake this effort.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. We have tried to give detail method in this study</p>
<p><b>Methods</b></p>	
<p>The references for the sample size are presented to support a sample size of 5:1 for the psychometric testing. The references to Gorsuch (1983) and Hatcher (1994) are not in the reference list, Osborne and Costello, 2004 do not recommend 5:1 ratio - the chart in their article clearly indicates this size is subject to too much error and pearson &amp; Mundform paper refers to dichotomous items. There should be a reference for sample size for CFA - generally it is a minimum of 300. Could be stated here that the sample size is recommended for initial psychometric testing of reliability and scale and item analysis - this is from a reference you cited elsewhere Sousa &amp; Rojjanasrirat, 2011.</p>	<p>Thank you for identifying this oversight. We have revised the subsection 'participants and setting' as suggestion. We have stated in the subsection participants and setting about the sample size recommendation The information can be found in participants and setting line 226 -233</p>
<p>In the data analysis section line 578 - you state 'the factor loading for each item that matched with the sample size...." Please clarify what this means.</p>	<p>This explanation is based on one book about multivariate data analysis (Hair, Black, Babin, &amp; Anderson, 2013) that explains guidelines for identifying significant factor loadings based on sample size for EFAs. For example, in a sample of 100 respondents, factor loadings of .55 and above are considered significant. For this research of 146 respondents, factor loading of 0.45 and above are considered significant. We have revised the sentence for flow in line 530 - 535 Subsection step 7 (B)</p>

<p>The tests referred to in the data analysis section are not the same as reported in Table 3. For example NFI is not in table Criteria for SRMR are not included. Table 3 includes X2/df but there is not mention of it in the data analysis section nor are norms included. TLI is included in results - I assume replacing what you called NFI in the data analysis description. The data analysis description also included detail on the interpretation of X2 and its p value yet there are no results related to chi square test with p value. The data analysis, results of CFA and table 3 should contain the same tests and results.</p>	<p>Thank you for this suggestion. We have adjusted again the information in the data analysis in subsection step 7 B and Table 3</p>
<p>Normally it is recommended that EFA and CFA not be done on the same sample. Why not just report the CFA with reporting of items deleted based on fit.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. We tried to analyze using CFA for original factor structure and deleted items based on the standardized loading estimate in CFA &gt; 0.5, but we did not meet the fit model. Hence, we followed the other reviewer's suggestion for conducting EFA before CFA. We have searched the matching references to strengthen this decision that we have explained in line 543 - 546 We have also listed this issue as a limitation</p>
<p>Limitations: The sample size limitation for CFA should be acknowledged; indicating the factor structure could be refined in future studies with a larger sample. In addition, it would be helpful to indicate that the factor structure identified in this study applies only to the study population of parents of LBW babies and may be different for parents of other hospitalized children with different conditions and of different ages. The items that were eliminated for this adaptation may be more applicable to these other parent samples; this requires further testing.</p>	<p>Thank you for this suggestion. This consideration has helped us considerably. We have stated all recommendations in the limitations section</p>
<p>Figure 1 requires a detailed legend.</p>	<p>We have added a legend for the figure 2</p>

### Reviewer 3

Comment	Response
<p>this is an interesting submission. The reporting of your study lacks transparency .</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. We have tried to describe this study more</p>

For example the setting is not included. Nor is the potential sample size	transparently, as per our comments following. We have added the setting in the section 'participants and setting' in line 209 - 218
Did you do a power analysis	Yes, we did the power analysis and we have explained this in subsection 'participants and setting' line 244 -246
The tables could have some range of data included for the demographics Consider writing a table for the setting and state the number of women recruited form each site	We have added information about the setting and added this in Table 1
Please correct any English grammar mistakes . There are only a few .	Thank you for identifying our English grammar. We have carefully reviewed and revised accordingly
Shorten some sentences to make it easier to read and more descriptive.	We have tried to shorten the long sentences.
There is some assumptive language that is used and this requires deletion and further explanation or expansion.	Thank you for your suggestion. We have deleted our assumptive language and explained more with appropriate references
<b>Abstract</b>	
Abstract: contains acronyms that require to be spelt out in full	We have expanded the acronyms in full
The results are stated as ... <i>21 items that has 8 items</i> ... this is confusing requires rewording.	We have reworded this sentence in the subsection 'results'
The word similar in the next line refers to the original version however the reader does not know this unless they look it up. Remove the word similar ... if it is similar what are the changes made .. not discussed here.	Thank you for suggestion. We have deleted this sentence
Remove the word <i>excellent</i> in next line ... internal consistency is evident not excellent	Thank you for the input. We have amended accordingly
<b>Background</b>	
Background: language is a problem in the text in this section do not use assumptive language here are some examples of poorly written English . Please expand and explain	Thank you for the comment. We have deleted assumptive language and tried to expand and explain in this section.
Line 18 what are the children's health problems. The language here needs to be changed <i>being</i> is an inappropriate word to be used here	We have revised and clarified the sentence in line 16 - 18
Line 31 there are missing words, consider linking words for ENGLISH language	We have paraphrased the sentence in paragraph one in the background section in line 25 - 27
Line 38 what does <i>often</i> refer to?	The word often refers to LBW infant's problem We have paraphrased the sentence in line 29
Line 46 what condition happens suddenly?? expand explain	Thank you for the comment. We have expanded the information in line 40

Line 50 remove the word having and explain the way parents feel	Thank you for your correction. We have deleted the word <i>having</i> as suggested
Line 50 to line 70 is too long sentence.	We have paraphrased the sentence in line 42 - 50
Suggestion remove the references from between the text and place at the end so the flow improves for the reader	Thank you very much for your suggestion. We have removed the references between the text in line 42 – 50
Line 76 – 207 onwards consider discussing the literature rather than stating what it says. Is it consistent and are there any gaps how does the literature differ. Are there differences in different cultures of areas of the globe. Critically analyse the literature to identify why you need to do this research .	Thank you for your comment. We have re-written this line as suggested in line 64 - 154
Line 247 what are the well-established methodological approaches is this forward and backward translation and testing if so state it	We have described forward and backward translation as one step in the subsection ‘translation, adaptation and validation procedure’. In design, we have described in line 196
Participants : who were eligible and were there any exclusions	We have described this information in the subsection ‘participants and setting’ line 220 -224
Did you complete a power analysis for your sample size?	Yes, we did the power analysis and we have explained this in the subsection ‘participants and setting’ line 244
Add the setting somewhere here what are the units? where are they? and what size are they? ... what was the potential sample?	Thank you for your suggestion. We have added this information in the subsection ‘participants and setting’ in line 209 - 218
The steps or the subscales should be more clearly spelt out here for the reader. Consider breaking this section up a little as the sentence is quite long.	Thank you for your suggestion. We have divided the sentence up as suggested. In line 256 – 273.
Line 331 what is adequate reliability? is this correct terminology? Once again don’t use assumptive language	Thank you for identifying this terminology. We have corrected in line 282.
the reference in line 350 is mention twice ..	Thank you for this which we have now corrected.
could just mention the publication line 391 the word best is out of place choose another word here	Thank you for the comment. We have revised the word
In this section what is PI -TL and B -TL	We have revised the sentence to reduce confusion for the reader in step 1 to step 4.
Line 434 where were the eligible mother from? hwo were they chosen	We have added information about this as suggested in line 406 - 413
Line 434 what is I-CVI and lower down S-CVI	We have described I-CVI and S-CVI in the subsection ‘step 6’ line 456-460

<p>The testing seems to be valid however your explanation could be a little more transparent. Where did the seven expert members come from and why were they experts?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. We have added information about the seven experts in the subsection 'step 6' line 441 -447</p>
<p>Data collection. The word enumerators appears ... what or who were they .. researchers ?? who were the mothers recruited by. Were they know to the person who recruited them?</p>	<p>The enumerators were nurses who had research experience. The enumerators helped the researchers collect data because the data were collected at multi-sites. We have added detailed information in line 575 – 584.</p>
<p>Line 565 what was the qualitative data. Is this the correct word. This study is a quantitative study.</p>	<p>Thank you for your correction. We have revised accordingly.</p>
<p>In your analysis did you include a median and range or IQR this would be helpful.</p>	<p>Thank you for your suggestion. We have added this information in Table 1</p>
<p>Now that I read your levels of reliability and terminology is is explanatory why the word excellent is used. Perhaps a statement as to the grading of reliability should be used prior to this. make a section for reliability testing in your procedures</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. We have divided a section for reliability as suggested in subsection step 7 (C)</p>
<p>Results: there need to be consistency in reporting your figures here n= (%) is usually the correct way to report figures. Could you add a range and median here. Also, table 1 could do with some range within that.</p>	<p>We have revised Table 1 as suggested</p>
<p>Line 693 what is KMO and what is EFA</p>	<p>We have explained in the subsection 'construct validity'. KMO in line 513-515. EFA in line 503 and 511-513</p>
<p>In the confirmatory factor analysis and reasons for deleting items form some scales and placing them in others. Could this go into a table to be read easily. It is difficult to understand as the reader does not have access to the actual parent form to see what the components are.  Should his be attached as an appendix?</p>	<p>We have re-analyzed the data and described this in the results.  Thank you. We have added an appendix for the original factor structures for determining with Bahasa RHDS-Parent factor structures</p>
<p>the discussion lacks a little transparency and is difficult to understand about he factor structure. What is this? please explain. How important is this? I am confused about factor structure and subscales</p>	<p>The factor structure and subscales are similar. We decided to use the term <i>factor structure</i></p>
<p>Line 949 What other countries ?? expand and explain why you are commenting on this. What is the relevance .. is this a limitation? or consideration? some wording</p>	<p>We have paraphrased the sentence in line 890 -895</p>

is used too frequently and sentences too long	This sentence describes the difference between the Bahasa RHDS and Chinese RHDS.
Lines 1055 ... this text should be really in the results with all these figures. It is possible to explain without listing all the values for the Cronbach. Be careful not to repeat yourself the reader will lose interest.	Thank you for the helpful input. We have revised this line 946 - 966
Your comments are good, and the comparison is being made to demonstrate the importance of a reliable tool.	Thank you
Some of this is your setting. consider making a table that will explain the types of units available to be tested. Easy for the reader to see the comparison Also state the number of women that could be recruited form each unit. It will make your study more transparent.	We have added this information in Table 1
Conclusion Line 1152 -1161 .. this text is not really needed as it is already stated.	Thank you for your input. We have revised in line 1034 -1036
Referencing. check referencing in text as there are few small mistakes	Thank you for your valuable input. References have revised to author guidelines and by downloading the Journal of Pediatric Nursing style in our Mendeley
Tables: include in figure 1 a key to the meaning of the acronyms used	We have added a note for Figure 1
Table 1 can you add median and ranges to the deomgraphics	We have added the information in Table 1
Table 2 what are the values used in each section? as a reader I was finding it difficult to understand and interpret	Thank you for your valuable input. We have provided detailed information in Table 2

## REVIEW KEDUA

### Response to Editors and Reviewers

Dear Editors and Reviewers

Thank you for your comments on our paper. We have attempted to address each one and believe the paper is stronger as a result.

Editor

Comments	Response
Additional revisions are required.	Thank you for your suggestion. We have repaired according to reviewer comment

Review and revision by an English writing expert is required before consideration for publication	Thank you for your suggestion. We have done prior proofreading by Gadjah Mada University proofreader, but we have review and revised again by an English writing expert according to reviewers and editors comment.
---	---

Reviewer 1

Comments	Response
The authors have addressed most of my comments. However, for one of my previous comments on Table 2, I meant the author should present all the factor loadings for each item across the four factors. Now, we could only see the 29 loadings but it would be better to show all 116 loadings so that the readers can know the items selection process.	Thank you for your comment. We have added 116 loadings in Table 2
I saw the authors added a sentence in line 235 about sample size....."This sample size was also calculated using the G*Power software V 3.1 at power level of 81%, 0.05 alpha value and a medium effect size (0.3)."  I also used GPower myself (V3.1.9.4) but I did not know any function to compute the sample size for factor analysis or Cronbach's alpha.....could the authors provide more information on that? Otherwise, I'd suggest to remove this sentence as I feel strange that it would involve effect size (usually appear about statistical testing, seems no hypothesis in the manuscript?).	Thank you for this oversight. We have deleted the sentence about GPower. Finally we used ratio of five individuals for each items of instrument for calculated sample size
Also, I would suggest the authors to seek help in editing the manuscript to improve the readability. There are quite a lot of sentences with (grammatical) mistake. For examples, "The seven hospitals in this study had number of beds with a total of 54 beds for five public hospital" , "The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett sphericity tests were used to confirmed suitability of the sample for conducting EFA", "To determine internal consistency reliability estimates, Cronbach's alpha is calculated and described as Excellent"	Thank you for your suggestion. We have done prior proofreading by Gadjah Mada University proofreader, but we have review and revised again by an English writing expert

	<p>Additional information</p> <p>According to reviewer 2 comment that the sample size for this study which is small for the number of items in the scale and definitely too small to split the same sample for EFA and CFA. The reviewer suggests to report one or the other but not both. So we finally deleted the CFA analysis</p>
--	---

#### Reviewer 2

Comments	Response
Thank you for the detailed response to prior comments. I have some additional comments.	Thank you for your comment.
Abstract: design and methods. Calling adaptation/translation is not a cross sectional design. You used a 7 step translation and psychometric evaluation process.	Thank you for your valuable inputs. We have repaired the sentence
Abstract: results: four-factor structure was evident (not achieved) from EFA and CFA. Use 2 decimal points for Cronbach's alpha)	Thank you for your valuable inputs. We have changed the sentence
Line 25 – reference is missing	Thank you for your comment. We have added reference
Line 29 – grammar needs correction-remove the words ‘with that problem explained above often)	Thank you for your comment.
Line 35 – Admission should not be capitalized	Thank you for your comment. We have revised
Line 42 - should parents <u>may</u> experience	Thank you for your comment. We have revised
Line 52 – reword – use either readiness for discharge or readiness to go home... not both	Thank you for your comment. We have revised
Line 68 Weiss et al 2019 is now published in print – Weiss et al., 2020	Thank you for this oversight. We have repaired it
Line 76 Lerret and Weiss is not about LBW babies	Thank you for this oversight. We have deleted this unrelated reference.
Line 112 – is should be are.	Thank you for this oversight. We have replaced
Line 126 – ‘measure parents’ readiness to manage the care for their hospitalized children’. The parent needs to be ready to manage the care of the child once they are	Thank you for your suggestion. We have reworded according your input

home from the hospital. The sentence needs to be reworded.	
Line 143 – be genders do you mean differences between mothers and fathers... As written, the term gender could refer to parent or child ( in any case the term would be sex not gender)	Thank you for the comment. We have revised it
Line 188 – cross-sectional design was used for psychometric testing. Describe the translation/adaptation process first then the psychometrics testing.	Thank you for this oversight. We have re-arrange the sentences.
Line 226 to 246 – I am confused about the sample size. First you present support for a sample size of at least 100. Then 5 participants per item ( $29 \times 5 = 145$ ). Then a power analysis at 80%, $p = .05$ for a .3 effect size but without a final sample size estimate. I suggest you choose the method you want to present and indicate if the power analysis was specifically for CFA estimation.	Thank you for the valuable input. We have revised it and choose one method for this study and repaired the sentence.
Lines 252-256 are repetitive of line 126 – it is stated better here but the same statement should not be included twice with the same wording.	Thank you for your comment
Line 314-318. The statement is incorrect. The Bahasa Indonesian form of the RHDS-Parent was adapted from the original English 29 item scale in 5 subscales using the crosscultural adaptation and translation method described by XXX	Thank you for your valuable input. I have revised it according your input
Line 355 – different <u>than</u> in step 1.	Thank you for your valuable input. I have revised it according your input
Line 445 - expert should be experts	Thank you for your valuable input. I have revised it according your input
Line 447 - what does ‘and were not included in the study’ mean? Were experts members of the research team?	Thank you for your comment We mean experts not included in psychometric step. We have deleted the confusing wording
Lines 455-466 – there is not reference for calculating I/CVI and S/CVI – are you using Polit and Beck, 2006 or another source for CVI.	Thank you for this oversight. We have added reference about I-CVI and S-CVI

Line 488 - 'Data were analyzed after all data were collected' can be omitted.	Thank you for your comment. We have omitted it
Line 488- 490 'This step involved determining descriptive analysis.... ' is grammatically incorrect.	Thank you for your comment. We have repaired it
Line 498- standard deviation and range (not standard deviations and ranges)	Thank you for your comment. We have repaired it
Line 516 – confirmed should be confirm	Thank you for your comment. We have repaired it
Line 524 - "A satisfactory result was achieved with KMO value >0.80 and Bartlett sphericity <0.001." should be moved up in the paragraph after the earlier reference to KMO.	Thank you for this oversight. We have moved it
Line 535-546. The use of the reference by Xu to support doing CFA on the same sample as the EFA is not appropriate. Just because someone else managed to publish doing this doesn't mean it is correct. The general rule is that you shouldn't do CFA and EFA on the same sample unless you can split the sample into 2 samples, with ½ used for EFA and ½ used for CFA. (Another reviewer also noted this problem). But you have a sample size for 145 which is small for the number of items in the scale and definitely too small to split the same. (Many consider 300 as a minimum for conducting factor analysis). I suggest you decide to report one or the other but not both. You can make the case for either one, either exploring the structure evident in your Indonesian sample, or CFA to explore if the apriori structure is evident in the Indonesian sample. But with a sample size of 145 not both.	Thank you for your suggestion We finally reported EFA for this study
Lines 565-569. Reformat the parentheses to $\alpha = .80 - .90$ (for example)	Thank you for your input We have revised
Line 683. 'The most of mothers 46.6% (n=68) recruited from public hospital A'. This statement should be reworded. Nearly half of the mothers in the sample were recruited from public hospital A.	Thank you for your input We have revised

Line 691-693. This sentence can be removed – The KMO /Bartlett's information repeats a statement in an earlier section.	Thank you for your suggestion. We have removed this sentence.
Line 693 'The EFA identified variance' is not worded correctly. The 4 factors with eigenvalues >1 explained XX% of variance.	Thank you for your suggestion. We have revised this sentence.
Line 700 – just a comment - my concern is with the use of <.45 for deletion of items. More commonly <.30 is used. I know you are using .45 because of the relatively small sample size. But the tradeoff is you may be eliminating informative items, just to raise the alpha.	Thank you for your comment. The problem in this study is the small sample.
Line 751 – change effectively to reliably	Thank you for your suggestion. We have revised it
Line 753 - Table 4 can now be deleted – all the information is now in the text.	Thank you for your suggestion. We have removed Table 4
Line 798 - remove the word 'an' before objectives	Thank you for your suggestion. We have removed it
Line 826-828 – 'Factor structure is defined as a simple correlation between items and factors (Hair et al., 2013)' This statement seems incorrect. Factor structure is based on correlations among items.	Thank you for your suggestion. We have revised it
Line 852 – Two factors regarding knowledge.... (remove the word structure)	Thank you for your suggestion. We have removed it
Line 890 – should be "This differs from..."	Thank you for your suggestion. We have revised it
Line 972 – I would change insufficient to relative small numbers....	Thank you for your suggestion. We have revised it
Line 1569 Table 3 the comma should be a period.	We removed Table 3 because this is the CFA result
Line 1578 remove Table 4	Thank you for your suggestion. We have removed it
Line 1625 – translator is spelled incorrectly	Thank you for your oversight. We have revised it
Line 1630 – committee is spelled incorrectly - reword one another independent translator	Thank you for your oversight. We have revised it
Line 1634-35 – English is capitalized	Thank you for your oversight. We have revised it
Line 1647-50 – many typographical and grammar errors	Thank you for your oversight. We have revised it

Line 1663 – fix grammar	Thank you for your oversight. We have revised it
Line 1743-1780 Appendix – this appears to be the results of prior research by the original author ( how items loaded on original factors but omitting the numeric values. It does not appear to be how <u>your</u> results loaded on the apriori factors. This appendix should be removed. Another journal holds the copyright.	Thank you for your suggestion. We have removed it
Figure 1 title – this figure is not a path diagram – write a more appropriate title	Thank you for your oversight. We have revised it
Figure 2 title – this figure is the CFA result – write a more appropriate title.	We removed Figure 2 because this is the CFA result

## REVIEW KETIGA

### Response to Editors and Reviewers

Dear Editors and Reviewers

Thank you for your comments on our paper. We have attempted to address each one and believe the paper is stronger as a result.

Editor

Comments	Response
Thank you for revising the manuscript with careful attention to the reviewers' comments. There are just a few minor corrections required.	Thank you for your comments.
Line 34: Remove “on”	Thank you for your suggestions. We have revised it

Line 48: Change to - All of these experiences may impact achievement of the parental role and parents' readiness	Thank you for your valuable input. We have revised the sentence.
Line 68: Change to – management of their infant	Thank you for your suggestions. We have revised it
Line 98: Change to - are in the English	Thank you for your suggestions. We have revised it
Line 136: Change sex to genders	Thank you for your suggestions. We have revised it
Line 608: Remove study number	Thank you for your suggestions. We have removed study number
Line 668: How many parents were approached to solicit the sample of 146 who agreed?	It was 158 mothers.

#### Reviewer 1

Comments	Response
Thank you for the revision, I think the manuscript is ready for publication. Just the font size of Figure 1 is too small, it may be better to change the format of Figure 1 and use larger font size.	Thank you for your input. We have changed the font size

#### Reviewer 2

Comments	Response
Thank you for attending to all the requested revisions. There are just a few minor corrections needed for publication.	Thank you for your comments
Highlights: 1. unit should be units 2. should be 'The Bahasa Indonesia version of the RHDS-Parent Form, translated and adapted from the original English version, has acceptable reliability and validity for use with NICU parents. 3. is correct as is.	Thank you for your valuable input. We have revised the sentence.
Abstract: reword practice implications . This questionnaire can be used by nurses to measure readiness for discharge of parents of low birthweight babies. Further testing is needed with a larger sample and parents of children of other ages and conditions for instrument improvement.	Thank you for your valuable suggestion. We have changed the sentence.

<p>The word ' the' is missing in a few places...  In American English form it should be added  Line 39 add 'the' before NICU  Line 70 add 'the' before hospital  Line 123 add 'the' before hospital</p>	<p>Thank you for your suggestions. We have revised it</p>
<p>Line 451 I do not know what the sentence means: The content validity index was calculated prior to the item-level content validity index (I-CVI) and then the scale-level content validity index continued (S-CVI/Ave). I think the sentence should be simply "Item-level content validity ( I-CVI) and scale-level average CVI (S-CVI/Ave) were calculated".</p>	<p>Thank you for this oversight. We have re-arrange the sentences as suggestion.</p>
<p>Line 575 competing should be completing</p>	<p>Thank you for your suggestions. We have revised it.</p>
<p>ine 691. The sentence should be revised to " The four factors with eigenvalues &gt;1 explained 52.79% of scale variance but were not consistent with the five factors in the 29 items original version RHDS-Parent."</p>	<p>Thank you for this oversight. We have re-arrange the sentences as suggestion.</p>
<p>Line 702 add comma after four factors</p>	<p>Thank you for your suggestions. We have added comma after four factors</p>
<p>Line 809 - the sentence does not make sense as is. Rerword to "... and psychometric testing was conducted to achieve a conceptually equivalent Bahasa translation of the original English version of the instrument."</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. We have revised this accordingly</p>
<p>Line 824 change to Factor structure is based on correlations among items ( defined is not the right word)</p>	<p>Thank you for this oversight. We have re-arrange the sentences accordingly.</p>
<p>Line 826 - change to " a four factor structure"</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. We have revised this accordingly</p>
<p>Line 888 - change performed to 'included'</p>	<p>Thank you for your suggestions. We have revised it</p>
<p>Line 1002 - remove 'as one initial tool'. This part of the sentence doesn't make sense to me.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. We have removed accordingly</p>

## REVIEW KEEMPAT

### Response to Editors and Reviewers

Dear Editors and Reviewers

Thank you for your comments on our paper. We have attempted to address each one and believe the paper is stronger as a result.

Editor

Comments	Response
Change: many preterm have lower Apgar scores TO: many preterm infants have lower Apgar scores	Thank you for your comment. We have revised it in line 23.
Is there a full title for this acronym? If so, it should be spelled out first: RHDS-Parent	Thank you for your comment. We have added a full title for RHDS-Parent in line 112.
The term enumerators is not used in US journals; what is the meaning of enumerators? Do you mean data collectors?	Thank you for your comment. We have revised the term in lines 560 & 562.
This can be deleted: on 14 May 2018	Thank you for your comment. We have deleted it in line 608.
The presentation of findings should be changed from: 76% (n=111) TO 111 (76%)	Thank you for your comment. We have revised the presentation of findings in lines 674-680.
The order of the presentation in the narrative should be changed to Practice Implications, Limitations and Conclusion.	Thank you for your comment. We have revised the order of the presentation to Practice Implications, Limitations and Conclusion.