

Response to Reviewer 1

We wish to thank you for the opportunity to submit a revision of the manuscript for consideration for publication. We addressed all your comments and suggestions and the point-by-point response is detailed below. Our sincere thanks go out to you for taking the time to review our work. We believe your comments contributed to improving the manuscript and enhancing its clarity.

Comments

The paper by Yosef et al deals with multidimensional participation of ABI patients in daily activities. The paper is interesting and has some strengths, as the use of ICF to categorize results, and the relationship between the perceived environmental accessibility and the different aspects of participation, as well as the use of COPM.

However, some points remain difficult to understand.

Point 1: In the methods part there is no explanation ABOUT THE Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory-4 despite the fact that it is deeply used for results.

Response 1: I apologize, the paragraph concerning the MPAI-4 was probably omitted while working on the manuscript. It has been reinserted into the measures section. Thank you for noticing this.

Point 2: It is not clear who conducted the participation measures and where (patient's home? Outpatient clinics?)

Response 2: Thank you for your comment. You can find this information in the procedure chapter (lines 157-162). We changed the wording to make it clearer.

Point 3: In the methods authors stated they have used two scales for depression, probably due to the age gaps within the sample, but little information is given about how, why and if the two groups resulted significantly different by using different scales.

Response 2: During the recruitment process, we decided to expand the recruitment to include younger adults; therefore, we switched from the GDS to the PHQ-9, which led to two measures being used. This has been clarified within the text and we hope it is now clearer (line 185).

Point 4: Another point that needs more clarification is the comparison between subjective and objective evaluation. How is possible to “explore the compatibility of the objective and subjective aspects of participation” if you analyzed occupational “subjective” problems by using COPM, and then categorized results according to the 9 ICF domains, while you use a different classification for the objective evaluation?”.

Date: 11/8/22

As well, "Since the MPAl-4-P items and ICF domains do not exactly align; the occupational problems were reclassified by areas of participation according to the MPAl-4-P items." (p.10)

Response 2: We appreciate your comment, which led us to realize that this issue lacks clarity. Therefore, we tried to clarify it.

To avoid the confusion that you were referring to, we emphasized throughout the text that the compatibility examination was between the results of the MPAl-4-P and the results of the COPM, and deleted the confusing sentence that you quoted from the results on page 10 (line 358). We also clarified it more in the text (lines 128, 237, 359, 371).

Additionally, we elaborated on this problem in the limitations section (lines 521-523).

Point 5: As last methodological remark, from the statistics point of view, significance level is only given as $p < 0.05$, but in this multi test setting, it should be advisable to provide actual significance level and in case also state if they are raw or corrected for multiple comparison results.

Response 2: Thank you for this comment. As suggested, we added the p values to Table 3. However, given the exploratory nature of the study, multiple testing corrections were not performed in the statistical analyses- We added this explanation in the statistical analysis section.

Date: 11/8/22