

Bryan M. Pate
2402 Southwood Dr.
Champaign, IL 61821

July 20, 2017

To Whom It May Concern:

This is a Certificate of Proofread for the paper titled

CROSS-CULTURAL AND PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES EVALUATION OF THE
EXERCISE SELF-EFFICACY SCALE IN INDIVIDUALS WITH SPINAL CORD
INJURY

This paper came to me already translated; I proofread papers, but do not translate them. Having reread the paper, I do certify that the English in it is good English. If there are divergences between the words used in Portuguese and those in English, I do not see that, as I am not the translator. As to there being other possibilities for word choice in certain places in the paper, that is certainly so. In some cases, those possibilities will be strictly stylistic. In others, the word I left in the text has a meaning that fits; however, as I stated, I am not a translator. If there is a better fit for a word based on the Portuguese, such knowledge will be unavailable to me. If there is divergence between the Portuguese and English, that will not be apparent to me. The grammar is proper; the sentences make sense. If there are preferences for word choice, they are just that: preferences.

I will address some of the other concerns that seem to have been expressed below:

One specific word choice that seems to be an issue is that of 'effective' vs. 'efficacious' or 'effectiveness' vs. 'efficacy'. In normal contexts, these are essentially interchangeable. In certain medical contexts, 'efficacy' is applicable for clinical trials, while 'effectiveness' would be for real-world clinical contexts. The instant paper is one that studies real-world clinical contexts, thus 'effectiveness' would seem to be the proper choice.

Another issue raised concerned 'between' and 'among'. In the first paragraph of the introduction, there is the sentence: "The spinal cord acts as a bidirectional conduction pathway between the brain and the motor, sensory and autonomic regions of the human body." Here, we have four (4) things, but 'between' is the appropriate preposition, rather than 'among'. In this case, what is described is actually four one-to-one relationships: between the brain and the motor region; between the brain and the sensory region; etc. 'Among' would carry a different meaning and one that would be inaccurate.

I am uncertain what instances of “there were” should have been “there was,” according to the editors. As an instance that often confuses non-native speakers of English, consider p. 9, first full paragraph: “There were a similar number of individuals....” Here, we have the construct ‘number of’. Even though, strictly speaking, ‘number’ is singular, ‘number of’ takes the plural. This same construct occurs on p. 11, and probably other places.

Definite article usage – ‘the’ – is a matter of stylistic preference, in many cases. Take the following example found on p. 5, first full paragraph, for example: “...about the possible barriers to participation in physical exercise for people with physical disabilities and still less is known about the barriers for individuals with SCI....” The two definite articles in this portion of the sentence could both be eliminated. Since there is a particular context noted for each set of ‘barriers’, “the” provides an idea of specificity. It’s not necessary, but neither is it improper usage of the definite article. If left out, another editor could as easily complain about its absence as the present editor has complained concerning its inclusion.

Sincerely,

Bryan M. Pate

BA English, Middle Tennessee State University and MA, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.