

- However, some points will improve the manuscript dramatically as stated below. In addition, running the factor analysis including the exploratory (EFA) and confirmatory (CFA) will ultimate the psychometric properties because of the large sample and its suitability.

Response: Thank you for your valuable feedback. We have conducted a factor analysis that identified a single-factor model comprising 23 items, with 2 items not loading onto the factor matrix. Based on this identified structure, we re-analyzed the measurement properties of the CSI-Ar. The unidimensionality of CSI-Ar Part A was confirmed, evidenced by a high McDonald's omega total value ( $\omega_t = 0.92$ ). Details of the statistical analyses and the results from the factor analysis have been incorporated into the revised manuscript. (P 11, L 253) and (P 14, L 324)

Reply: you did a great job with the factor analysis, and you have been reported the full information in an efficient manner. However I have some comment.

- 1- Why did you use the maximum likelihood extraction MLE for the factor analysis?  
The MLE uses for the normal distribution data. Hence your data is abnormally distributed you must use the principal axis factor (PAF).
  - a. Check this reference [Watkins MW. Exploratory Factor Analysis: A Guide to Best Practice. J Black Psychol. 2018;44(3):219–46.]
- 2- In the Table 2 title you depict the extraction which has been used was the “principal axis factor and promax rotation”. This is not matching with your text explanation of the factor analysis. Make sure of which extraction you were choses.
- 3- Again, since you have enough participants, I highly recommend running the confirmatory factor analysis. This type of factoring will strongly support the validity of the questionnaire.
  - a. You may use this reference as a guide [Williams B, Onsman A, Brown T. Exploratory Factor Analysis: A Five-Step Guide for Novices. Australasian Journal of Paramedicine. 2010;8:1–13.

- Line 290-291: "The CSI-Ar was completed twice by 47 patients, with a 2-week delay between the two assessments."

o Provide from the literature a reference

Response: The reviewer's comment is unclear. The results reported here are ours. We would appreciate it if the reviewer clarifies their comment.

Reply: My apologies for the vague comment. On other words, provide a reference support your delaying period of the 2 weeks between the two assessments.