

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tp-22-659>

Reviewer A

Comment 1

This is an extremely thorough and well-written paper. I have virtually no criticisms and would recommend publication with only minor grammatical and typographical edits.

A few potential areas for grammatical improvement I found below:

The wording in line 73 is a little awkward “present the patients perspective.”

Line 378 needs grammatical help.

Lines 378-382 are confusing and don't add much

Reply 1

Thanks for your comment.

We have carefully reviewed the paper again to address any such issues and ensured its overall clarity and coherence.

Reviewer B

Comment 1

The authors appear to be experienced with this validity work and have done an excellent job of presenting their findings with a nice contribution to the literature. The construct validity also further strengthens the validity of the EOSQ-SELF beyond just validating the Chinese language version as acceptable.

Reply 1

Thank you for your insightful feedback and positive evaluation of our work. We greatly appreciate your recognition of our experience in validity research and the contribution our findings make to the existing literature.

Reviewer C

1. It's suggested to modify “the participants” to “the participants and their family members” in the below sentence.

125 were excluded from this study. The purpose of this study was explained to the participants and
126 informed consent was obtained. The scales was issued and collected through an online tool with a

Reply 1

Thanks for your comment.

The “the participants” has been modified to “the participants and their family members”.

2. Figures and tables

- Please double-check the P-value in the following sentences, which cannot match Figure 2.

The total score of the Chinese EOSQ-SELF was significantly greater in patients with Cobb angles $\leq 50^\circ$ than in patients with Cobb angles $> 50^\circ$ [85.83 (78.37, 90.28) vs. 59.65 (53.06, 64.01); $P < 0.001$]. Specifically, there was a strong negative correlation between the Cobb angle and total score ($r = -0.795$, $P < 0.001$). Significant differences also were detected in patients with different aetiologies ($P < 0.001$), treatment statuses ($P < 0.001$), and ambulatory abilities ($P < 0.001$) (Figure 2).

Figure 2. Comparison of total scores between EOS patients. (A) Cobb angle $\leq 50^\circ$ and $> 50^\circ$. * vs.

Cobb angle $\leq 50^\circ$ ($P < 0.05$); (B) Etiology. * vs. idiopathic ($P < 0.05$), † vs. congenital ($P < 0.05$),

^ vs. syndromic ($P < 0.05$); (C) Treatment status. GR indicates growing rod. * vs. observation ($P < 0.05$), † vs. bracing ($P < 0.05$); (D) Ambulatory ability; * vs. complete-ambulatory ($P < 0.05$), †

vs. ambulatory with ais ($P < 0.05$)^{e†}

- Please check through your Figures and Tables to ensure all the abbreviations have been defined in **each** legend. For example, please provide the full name of EOS in Figure 1.
- Please indicate how data are presented in Table 1. N (%), mean \pm SD for example.

Reply 2

Thanks for your comments.

The P-value has been checked. All the abbreviations have been defined in each legend. How data are presented in Table 1 has been indicated.

Reviewer D

The article is generally okay with not many language issues.

Some Suggestions / Comments:

Comment 1

Line 24, 98: “on healthcare”

Reply 1

It has been revised.

Comment 2

Line 27, 99: “As there is a significant number of EOS patients in China” (word choice)

Reply 2

It has been revised.

Comment 3

Line 29: please define “EOSQ-24”

Reply 3

It has been revised.

Comment 4

Line 52: “Conclusions” (with “s” as our usual practice)

Reply 4

It has been revised.

Comment 5

Line 72: “and impact of the illness on...” (word choice)

Reply 5

It has been revised.

Comment 6

Line 87: “should be considered” (word choice)

Reply 6

It has been revised.

Comment 7

Line 92-93: “et al.” (with a dot at the end, please check across the whole paper)

Reply 7

It has been revised.

Comment 8

Line 100: “of paramount importance”

Reply 8

It has been revised.

Comment 9

Line 106: “We present this article...” (our usual practice)

Reply 9

It has been revised.

Comment 10

Line 117: “with intellectual disability”

Reply 10

It has been revised.

Comment 11

Line 339: “due to the involvement of only a single item in the domain.” (word choice)

Reply 11

It has been revised.

Comment 12

Line 380: “illness-specific” (“disease” seems to be related to virus or bacteria; “illness” sounds better; for author to review and consider)

Reply 12

It has been revised.

Comment 13

Line 404-405: “were selected for validity construction.” (noun phrase here)

Reply 13

It has been revised.

Comment 14

Line 405: “are solely applied” (simple present tense would be fine for general fact description)

Reply 14

It has been revised.

Comment 15

Line 434, 459-460: “and the important minimal clinical difference” (word arrangement)

Reply 15

The minimal clinically important difference (MCID) is a concept used in clinical research and practice to determine the smallest change in a patient's condition that is considered meaningful or significant. It is a measure of the smallest amount of change in a particular outcome measure that would lead to a change in clinical management or patient-reported outcomes. The word of MCID has been used in many literature (DOI: 10.2106/JBJS.RVW.22.00200; DOI: 10.1016/j.spinee.2023.05.001; DOI: 10.1016/j.spinee.2021.10.010) Therefore, the MCID should not be arrangement as “important minimal clinical difference.”

Comment 16

Line 438-439: “the EOSQ-SELF is currently the only sole patient self-report and EOS-specific HRQoL assessment tool.” (word choice)

Reply 16

It has been revised.

Comment 17

Line 440: “should also be applied as a ...” (verb usage)

Reply 17

It has been revised.

Comment 18

Line 442: “needs to be” (verb usage)

Reply 18

It has been revised.

Comment 19

Line 445: please review of what is “construct”, a noun is needed here

Reply 19

The “construct” here has been deleted.

Comment 20

Line 450: “consistent with the original version” (adj. here)

Reply 20

It has been revised.

Comment 21

Line 451: “to improve the construction validity, several modifications to the original version...”

Reply 21

It has been revised.

Comment 22

Line 464: “or non-profit”

Reply 22

It has been revised.