
We would like to respond to the statement by Armijo-Olivo and colleagues1 that the Physiotherapy Evidence Database (PEDro) scale has not been adequately developed or adequately tested for reliability and validity. Because no citations were provided for this statement, readers may have been left with the impression that there has been no research activity in this area. That is far from true.

There has been considerable evaluation of the clinimetric properties of the PEDro scale.2–14 For example, studies have reported acceptably high reliability for individual ratings and consensus ratings of both the English2 and Portuguese5 versions of the PEDro scale. A Rasch analysis of the PEDro scale2 has provided evidence that the PEDro scale can be used as a continuous scale for measuring the methodological quality and statistical reporting of trials. There also is evidence for convergent and construct validity of the PEDro scale summary score and 8 of the 11 individual items.8

S.J. Kamper, PT, PhD, The George Institute for Global Health, The University of Sydney.
Dr Maher, Dr Elkins, Dr Herbert, Dr Moseley, and Dr Sherrington developed the PEDro scale and undertook several studies investigating its clinimetric properties.

This letter was posted as a Rapid Response on October 6, 2014 at ptjournal.aapt.org.
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In response to Maher and colleagues’ letter,1 we would like to point out that in our report,2 we made a general statement regarding psychometric properties of the quality assessment tools used in physical therapy, and we did not specifically state that the Physiotherapy Evidence Database (PEDro) scale has not been appropriately tested for validity or reliability. This statement was based on our previous review, which investigated the psychometric properties of tools to evaluate the quality of randomized controlled trials in health research and especially in physical therapy.3 The above-mentioned review highlighted that most of the existing scales to determine trial quality were not adequately developed, including the PEDro scale. According to the developers of the PEDro scale, the scale was developed based on the Delphi list.4 Based on our results,3 the Delphi list lacked internal consistency and construct validity. These psychometric properties are of importance in any scale because they indicate that the construct—in this case, “methodological quality” (or “risk of bias”), the more current term for this concept)—is fully represented by the items of the scale (internal