

## PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

### ARTICLE DETAILS

<b>TITLE (PROVISIONAL)</b>	Translating the Symptom Screening in Pediatrics Tool (SSPedi) into French and Among French-speaking Children Receiving Cancer Treatments, Evaluating Understandability and Cultural Relevance in a Multiple-Phase Descriptive Study
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Larouche, Valérie; Revon-Rivière, Gabriel; Johnston, Donna; Adeniyi, Oluwatoni; Giannakouros, Panagiota; Loves, Robyn; Tremblay, Jenna-Lee; Plenert, Erin; Dupuis, Lee; Sung, Lillian

### VERSION 1 – REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Eliane Marçon Barroso Centro Universitário da Fundação Educacional de Barretos, Brazil
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	29-Nov-2019

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>The aim of the authors' study was to translate SSPedi into French, and to evaluate understandability and cultural relevance among French-speaking children receiving cancer treatments. The original version of the tool was translated using good procedures, but no psychometric characteristics were assessed.</p> <p>The adaptation and translation of a questionnaire should always be validated by means of proper statistical tools to assess reliability and validity. An adapted questionnaire should show the same, or similar, psychometric properties as the original. In this paper the authors reported the linguistic translation process. However, methods that investigate reliability and validity, such as Cronbach's Alpha and test retest, were not performed.</p> <p>Therefore, it is incorrect to say in the title "French translation and validation of the Symptom Screening in Pediatrics Tool (SSPedi) linguistic validation process" and in the discussion section "We reported the process for translating and validating the French translation of SSPedi."</p> <p>In the introduction section the authors should have addressed features of the original questionnaire and the psychometric properties of that version in order to demonstrate how valid and reliable it is.</p> <p>In the methods section when the authors say that the interviews were adjudicated by the Toronto based team, they should mention characteristics of this team (doctors?, translators?...) because it is very important to have previously selected people in order to make the process more accurate.</p>
-------------------------	--

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Argerie Tsimicalis RN PhD McGill University, Canada
-----------------	--

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript and efforts to collectively offer much needed tools needed for the Francophone population. A few comments to enhance to the rigour:

- 1) Add a reference to indicate you translated the SSPedi into Spanish.
- 2) Please explicitly specify the design (i.e. in the abstract and body of text) before introducing all the various methods used to collect the data. E.g. A multi-phase, descriptive study was conducted to translated the SSPedi into French.
- 3). Indicate that this multi-site study was ethically approved for study.
- 4) If space permitted for this paper, please consider creating one figure to visually showcase the methods used to translate the tool into French.
- 5) Please indicate whether any analysis was conducted to compare the findings between French-speaking children from Canada and France. If so, please indicate there was or was not any difference.
- 6) With a sample of 1 HSCT recipient, I would refrain from indicating this tool is well-understood by the target audience in the second sentence of the discussion. It also contradicts your justification that you need at least 7 to 10 participants. You may add this in your limitation,
- 7) First time you mention 'linguistic differences' is in the discussion. If this is an important concept for your study, please introduce from the beginning and incorporate throughout.

**VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE**

Referee #1:

4. The aim of the authors' study was to translate SSPedi into French, and to evaluate understandability and cultural relevance among French-speaking children receiving cancer treatments. The original version of the tool was translated using good procedures, but no psychometric characteristics were assessed. The adaptation and translation of a questionnaire should always be validated by means of proper statistical tools to assess reliability and validity. An adapted questionnaire should show the same, or similar, psychometric properties as the original. In this paper the authors reported the linguistic translation process. However, methods that investigate reliability and validity, such as Cronbach's Alpha and test retest, were not performed.

Therefore, it is incorrect to say in the title “French translation and validation of the Symptom Screening in Pediatrics Tool (SSPedi) linguistic validation process” and in the discussion section “We reported the process for translating and validating the French translation of SSPedi.”

Response: Thank you for these comments. We have replaced the word “validation” with “evaluation” throughout the manuscript.

5. In the introduction section the authors should have addressed features of the original questionnaire and the psychometric properties of that version in order to demonstrate how valid and reliable it is.

Response: Thank you very much for the opportunity to include this information. We have added the following to the Background:

“We conducted a multi-center study in Canada and the United States to evaluate the psychometric

properties of SSPedi. SSPedi was reliable (internal consistency and test re-test and inter-rater reliability), valid (construct validity) and responsive to change in 502 English-speaking children 8-18 years of age receiving cancer therapies.(4) More specifically, the intraclass correlation coefficients were 0.88 (95% CI 0.82 to 0.92) for test re-test reliability, and 0.76 (95% confidence interval (CI) 0.71 to 0.80) for inter-rater reliability between children and parents. Mean difference in SSPedi scores between groups hypothesized to be more and less symptomatic was 7.8 (95% CI 6.4 to 9.2;  $P < 0.001$ ). (4) Construct validity was demonstrated as all hypothesized relationships among measures were observed. SSPedi was responsive to change; those who reported they were much better or worse on a global symptom change scale had significantly changed from their baseline score (mean absolute difference 5.6, 95% CI 3.8 to 7.5;  $P < 0.001$ ).”

6. In the methods section when the authors say that the interviews were adjudicated by the Toronto based team, they should mention characteristics of this team (doctors?, translators?...) because it is very important to have previously selected people in order to make the process more accurate.

Response: We added the following to the Methods to address this comment:

“The Toronto-based research team included one pediatric oncologist, one pediatric pharmacist, one clinical research manager and one research student.”

Referee #2:

7. Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript and efforts to collectively offer much needed tools needed for the Francophone population.

Response: Thank you for these comments.

8. Add a reference to indicate you translated the SSPedi into Spanish.

Response: The Spanish translation has not yet been published and thus, personal communication was indicated instead.

9. Please explicitly specify the design (i.e. in the abstract and body of text) before introducing all the various methods used to collect the data. E.g. A multi-phase, descriptive study was conducted to translated the SSPedi into French.

Response: We agree; the recommended sentence was added to the abstract and text.

10. Indicate that this multi-site study was ethically approved for study.

Response: Ethics approval was indicated in a separate section but agree that it is better placed within the body of the manuscript and thus, we have made this change.

11. If space permitted for this paper, please consider creating one figure to visually showcase the methods used to translate the tool into French.

Response: As there are already two tables and two figures, we felt a third figure may not be warranted since this information is described in the text. However, if requested by the Editor, we would be happy to add such a figure.

12. Please indicate whether any analysis was conducted to compare the findings between French-speaking children from Canada and France. If so, please indicate there was or was not any difference.

Response: We added the following to the Methods:

“There was no attempt to compare findings between French-speaking children from Canada and France.”

13. With a sample of 1 HSCT recipient, I would refrain from indicating this tool is well-understood by the target audience in the second sentence of the discussion. It also contradicts your justification that you need at least 7 to 10 participants. You may add this in your limitation.

Response: This is an excellent observation; thank you for this comment. To address it, we rephrased the first paragraph of the Discussion as follows:

“The final version was well-understood by French-speaking children receiving cancer treatments.”

And added the following limitation:

“In addition, only one HSCT recipient was included and thus, further evaluation in this population is warranted.”

14. First time you mention 'linguistic differences' is in the discussion. If this is an important concept for your study, please introduce from the beginning and incorporate throughout.

#### VERSION 2 – REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Eliane Marcon Barroso Centro Universitário da Fundação Educacional de Barretos Brazil
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	06-Feb-2020
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	The authors addressed my previous comments appropriately. Thank you for the opportunity to review this study.
<b>REVIEWER</b>	Argerie Tsimicalis McGill University, Canada
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	10-Feb-2020
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	No further comments. Thank you for your contributions and all the best bringing your research to practice.

#### VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Referee #1:

3. The authors addressed my previous comments appropriately. Thank you for the opportunity to review this study.

Response: Thank you for these comments.

Referee #2:

4. No further comments. Thank you for your contributions and all the best bringing your research to practice.

Response: Thank you for these comments.