

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Family Vulnerability Scale: evidence of content and internal structure validity

Evelyn Lima de Souza^{1*}¶, Ilana Eshriqui¹¶, Flávio Rebughini²¶, Eliana Tiemi Masuda^{1&},
Francisco Timbó de Paiva Neto^{1&}, Ricardo Macedo Lima^{1&}, Daiana Bonfim¹¶

¹ Center for Studies, Research and Practices in Primary Health Care and Networks (CEPPAR), Hospital Israelita Albert Einstein, São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil

² Department of Gerontology, School of Arts, Sciences and Humanities (EACH), University of São Paulo, São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil

*Corresponding author
E-mail: evelyn.lima@einstein.br (ELS)

¶ These authors were responsible for substantial contributions to conception and study design, acquisition, analysis and interpretation of data, drafting and revising the content, final approval of the version to be published and agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

& These authors were responsible for analysis and interpretation of data, drafting and revising the content, final approval of the version to be published and agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

26 **Abstract**

27 Introduction: territory view based on families' vulnerability strata allows identifying
28 different health needs that, in their turn, can guide healthcare at primary care scope.
29 Although there are instruments aimed at measuring family vulnerability, they still need
30 robust validity evidences; therefore, they represent a limitation for usability in a country
31 showing multiple socioeconomic and cultural realities, such as Brazil. The present study
32 introduces the development and search for evidences about the validity of the Family
33 Vulnerability Scale for Brazil, known as EVFAM-BR. Methods: items were generated
34 through exploratory qualitative study carried out with 123 professionals. Collected data
35 subsidized the generation of 92 initial items that were subjected to a panel of multi-
36 regional and multi-disciplinary judges (n = 73) to calculate the Content Validity Ratio
37 (CVR) – this process resulted in a version of the scale comprising 38 items.
38 Subsequently, it was applied to 1,255 individuals to find evidences about the internal-
39 structure validity by using the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). Dimensionality was
40 assessed through Robust Parallel Analysis and the model was tested through cross-
41 validation to find EVFAM-BR's final version. Results: the final version comprised 14
42 items distributed into four domains, with explained variance of 79.02%. All indicators
43 were within adequate and satisfactory limits, without any cross-loading and Heywood
44 Case issues. Reliability indices also reached adequate levels ($\alpha = 0.71$; $\omega = 0.70$; $glb =$
45 0.83 and ORION ranging from 0.80 to 0.93, between domains). Instrument's score was
46 subjected to normalization, and it pointed towards three vulnerability strata (0 to 4 –
47 Low; 5 to 6 – Moderate; 7 to 14 - High). Conclusion: the scale showed satisfactory
48 validity evidences, which were consistent, reliable ad robust; it led to a synthesized
49 instrument capable of accurately measuring and differentiating family vulnerability in
50 the primary care territory, in Brazil.

51

52 **Introduction**

53 The term vulnerability is the core of debates in different knowledge fields;
54 etymologically it would come from Latin “vulnerare” (harm, impair) and “bile”
55 (susceptible) [1]. However, the understanding about vulnerability shows variations
56 when different dimensions linked to this topic are taken into account [2]. Vulnerability,
57 in the Bioethics field, refers to being in danger or exposed to risk due to individual
58 weakness, which is a feature inherent to human beings [3]. As for the healthcare field,
59 this term has a broader meaning; it is associated with acknowledging humans as
60 susceptible to damage or to risks within the health/illness process due to social
61 disadvantages [4].

62 Although the literature presents different vulnerability definitions and assesses
63 individual predictors, the concept of family vulnerability is measurable through
64 different ways [4] because it must take into consideration this phenomenon from
65 multiple aspects that, in their turn, are linked to health needs of members from a given
66 family. Aspects related to the health condition of members composing the family
67 nucleus, as well as the community and social context, are elements to be taken into
68 account at the time to investigate vulnerability in families [5,6].

69 Thus, health services and managers must consider family vulnerability to
70 organize healthcare practices, mainly from the population perspective [7]. Accordingly,
71 territory view from vulnerability strata perspectives subsidizes the process to identify
72 health needs in different population groups [2]. Besides, family vulnerability
73 stratification is essential at the time to plan the offer of services in a given territory,
74 since it would help achieving equity and qualified of population-based care

75 management. Hence, considering health teams activities and the care provision order in
76 the Health Care Network based on the needs identified through family vulnerability
77 demands, it is needed to deepening in aspects composing family vulnerability.

78 Instruments and initiatives to ensure the observation of aspects likely presented
79 by family vulnerability as components to labor process organizations remain scarce.
80 Some global experiences are linked to this phenomenon: vulnerability-measuring
81 background lies on the United Nations Program for Development (UNPD); back in
82 2004, it elaborated the Disaster Risk Index (DRI) to measure and compare countries
83 within a process based on physical, social, economic and environmental factors [8].
84 Subsequently, in 2006, the Autonomous University of Madrid (Spain) estimated the
85 degree of vulnerability of citizens assumingly susceptible to lack of social protection,
86 based on countries belonging to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and
87 Development (OECD) [9]. With respect to the Latin scene, one research aimed at
88 measuring family vulnerability rates in a Colombian municipality based on a sample of
89 families from all socioeconomic strata living in an urban zone and in a rural one [10].

90 Other initiatives have been introduced and they aimed at developing instruments
91 to be used by primary healthcare (PHC) teams to measure family vulnerability and,
92 consequently, to contribute to plan healthcare provision in the Brazilian territory [11-
93 15]. However, instruments so far developed and used for such a purpose still need
94 robust evidences of their validity, since they present limitations to be used in a country
95 with continental dimensions, and multiple socioeconomic and cultural realities, like
96 Brazil.

97 Thus, it is essential reasoning about the concept of family vulnerability, with
98 emphasis on a diversified population and from this perspective, to develop an
99 instrument which could be used in a standardized way in national scope. Then, the

100 present study aim to seek validity evidences about the content and internal structure of
101 the Family Vulnerability Scale for Brazil (EVFAM-BR).

102

103 **Materials and methods**

104 The present study followed a psychometric nature design to seek evidences
105 about both content validity (stage 1) and internal structure (stage 2) based on current
106 recommendations by the Educational Research Association (AERA), the American
107 Psychological Association (APA) and the National Council on Measurement in
108 Education (NCME) [16]. The study was approved by the Ethics Research Committee of
109 *Hospital Israelita Albert Einstein*, which was approved on October 22, 2019 (nº
110 3.674.106, CAAE 12395919.0.0000.0071).

111

112 **Stage 1: content validity evidences**

113 PHC professionals from all Brazilian geographic regions were invited to join the
114 first qualitative exploratory stage of the study to define the concept of “family
115 vulnerability” and to identify factors likely associated with it, in order to subsidize the
116 development of items for the instrument. It was done to identify different
117 understandings about family vulnerability in different geographic regions countrywide.

118 The invitation was made based on the snowball method [17], by WhatsApp and
119 e-mail. Using the RedCap® electronic tool [18,19], an online semi-structured
120 questionnaire was made available for participants after they read the free consent form
121 and formally accepted to join the study.

122 The questionnaire comprised (i) respondents’ socioeconomic, demographic and
123 health profile identification, (ii) open questions about the concept of vulnerability and
124 scale applicability, and (iii) multiple-choice questions about the relevance of measuring

125 family vulnerability; the questions were distributed into 46 items elaborated from
126 individual and domestic registration forms used at the Brazilian public healthcare
127 system through e-SUS PHC system [20,21]. Frequencies of responses for items
128 expressed in multi-choice questions and the group of aspects identified in open
129 questions were taken into consideration based on the Content Analysis Technique in
130 order to elaborate the first version of items [22] – they were developed in an
131 interrogative way to allow dichotomous answers (“0 – no” and “1 – yes”).

132 Items developed from the previous stage were subjected to an extensive panel of
133 multi-regional and multi-disciplinary judges. The panel encompassed health
134 professionals, scholars and psychometrists who were invited to join the study through
135 the snowball method.

136 The large number of judges was explained by the need of calculating and
137 applying the instrument at national scope. The judges judged the items in the first
138 version of the instrument based on relevance and clarity criteria, as well as were
139 enquired about the need of changing the writing of any item. Then, option was made to
140 apply the Content Validity Ratio (CVR) scale [23] as the validity index to select the
141 items. CVR is calculated based on the number of judges in the panel [24,25] in order to
142 allow the adoption of a larger number of judges. CVR was initially applied to assess the
143 relevance of a given item in order to check whether it effectively measures the latent
144 variable: family vulnerability. CVR was represented as CVR-1 (the Item’s CVR) and
145 CVR-E (Scale CVR) – this last one corresponds to mean recorded for the CVR criteria.
146 It is important highlighting that a modified CVR version with two points, namely “no”
147 and “yes”, was adopted. The original version had three points and did not have an
148 effective practical effect, since, for CVR calculation purposes, it used to become
149 dichotomous. This procedure was already adopted in studies [26,27].

150 Oftentimes, the mean recorded for the assessed questionnaires is adopted;
151 therefore, a hierarchic flow was herein adopted, since other indicators, such as item's
152 clarity, were only analyzed after judges showed its relevance to testify that the item
153 actually assesses the instrument's latent variable. The application of requirements in the
154 same stage tends to inflate mean CVR and to launch items that do not measure the latent
155 variable to the next stage. Accordingly, as pointed out by DeVellis [28], a given item
156 can be relevant, but its words might be problematic. Thus, the second stage refers to
157 items' clarity (whether the item is well written in terms of its semantics). The third stage
158 assessed the need of changing the items' writing. The mean recorded for CVR was only
159 applied to items that adhered to the phenomenon.

160

161 **Stage 2: Evidences about internal structure validity**

162 The version subjected to content evidences was applied to users of PHC services
163 to find evidences about internal structure validity.

164 All data collectors were previously trained and clarified about the informed
165 consent form application, as well as about research aim, methodology and questions.
166 Study presentation and data collection flow were also previously carried out with teams
167 from the participating PHC services.

168 PHC services selection was based on municipalities presenting the largest
169 population of attendees of the Program to Support the Institutional Development by the
170 Unified Healthcare System (Proadi-SUS) in Brazil, PlanificaSUS [29]. It was done by
171 including at least one PHC service from each geographic region in the country. Thus,
172 data collection was carried out in 11 PHC services: 1 in Northern Brazil (Roraima
173 State), 1 in the Northeastern region (Pernambuco State) and 2 in Midwestern Brazil

174 (Mato Grosso State), 5 in the Southeastern region (São Paulo and Minas Gerais states)
175 and 2 in Southern Brazil (Paraná State).

176 The Covid-19 pandemic met the first data collection stage (from June to
177 November 2020); therefore, interviews with São Paulo healthcare unit users were
178 carried out by phone. Service managers were aware of it, since they provided
179 information to identify interviewees in the territory. As for the second data collection
180 time (from May to August 2022), users who had attended the participating PHC service
181 at data-collection day were asked to join the study.

182 Over 18-year-old participants were informed about the informed consent form at
183 both data-collection times and they only joined the research after signing it.
184 Subsequently, the structured questionnaire about the family vulnerability scale was
185 applied, and it was followed by participants featuring in RedCap® [18,19].

186

187 **Statistical analysis**

188 **Exploratory factor analysis**

189 The first stage of the analysis aimed at assessing whether the collected data were
190 prone to factorial through Measure of Sampling Adequacy (MSA). Bartlett sphericity,
191 determinant of the matrix and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) were assessed at this stage.
192 Besides assessing the dataset items, individual analysis was also assessed, as
193 recommended by Lorenzo-Seva and Ferrando [30]. The inadequacy of items to be
194 factored can affect model solution. Missing data were treated through the multiple
195 imputation technique [31].

196 Dimensionality testing was carried out through Parallel Analysis, based on
197 Optimal implementation of Parallel Analysis (PA) and Minimum rank factor analysis to
198 minimize the common variance of residues [32]. PA was implemented through

199 permutation with 500 random matrices. Dimensionality in exploratory factorial analysis
200 (unrestricted model) was tested through Parallel Analysis, which has been considered
201 more robust and accurate to test it [33-37].

202 Tetrachoric matrix estimates were carried out through Bayes Modal Estimation
203 [38], with Smoothing Ridge [39]. The use of tetrachoric/polychoric correlations tends to
204 increase the model's accuracy in comparison to Pearson's correlation [40,41].

205 Factors' extraction was performed through the RULS technique (Robust
206 Unweighted Least Squares), which reduces the residues in matrices that are more robust
207 in terms of abnormal data [42]. Promin oblique rotation would be used in case the
208 instrument emerged as multi-dimensional [43].

209 UNICO (Unidimensional Congruence > 0.95), ECV (Explained Common
210 Variance > 0.80 – Quinn, 2014) and MIREAL (Mean of Item Residual Absolute
211 Loadings < 0.30) were adopted as unidimensionality assessment indicator [44].

212 **Quality parameters of the instrument**

213 Instrument explained variance must be close to 60% [45]. Initial factorial load of
214 0.30 is recommended when the sample comprises less than 300 individuals [45];
215 communities must present values higher than 0.40 [46]. The maintenance or removal of
216 a given model item depend on factorial load magnitude, on the communities and on the
217 existence of cross-loading and Heywood cases, as well as on the impermeability of
218 factors. The unique directional correlation (Eta) through Pratt's Measure was adopted to
219 increase the accuracy of decision-making about the maintenance or removal of a given
220 item [47,48].

221 **Reliability**

222 Reliability was measured through four indicators: Cronbach's alpha [49],
223 Greatest Lower Bound – glb [50], Omega [51] - all three by means of Bayesian
224 estimates - and ORION (Overall Reliability of Fully-Informative prior Oblique N-EAP
225 scores) [52].

226 Cross-validation was applied to increase the model's reliability and replicability;
227 the Houdolt technique was also herein applied [53]. This technique divides the dataset
228 into a training sample - that can range from 10%, 30% to 50% - and into a dataset
229 known as test dataset [53]. The dataset in the present study was split in half by
230 randomly choosing the items. The Solomon technique [54] was adopted, so that dataset
231 division could be random and respect factorability's equivalence. The datasets were
232 labeled as follows: Full Sample (FS; n = 1,255); Training Sample (TrS n = 627) and
233 Test Sample (TsS; n = 628). According to Brown [55], cross-validation can be carried
234 out either through EFA or Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). FS analysis will only
235 take place if the model found in TrS and TsS can be replicated. This procedure was
236 already adopted in previous studies [56,57], and it follows contemporary
237 recommendations [58].

238 **Descriptive study and standardization**

239 An exploratory descriptive study of general scores recorded for the Family
240 Vulnerability Scale (FVS - EVFAM-BR, in Brazilian Portuguese) was carried out after
241 a solution for the internal structure was found. Results recorded for the items and for
242 total score were represented by answers' frequency, median (Md), interquartile interval
243 (IIQ), amplitude (amp), minimum (min) and maximum (max) value.

244 Standardization, in the first stage, was performed by identifying score cuts based
245 on participants' distribution. Despite this process, although participants' distribution is

246 recurrent in standardization studies, it can present distortions, because the score is not
247 directly analyzed, but it can be taken as consequence of participants' position in the
248 cutting points. Discriminant analysis of each one of the limits and Family Vulnerability
249 Scale scores were used to improve the accuracy of proposed cuts (within the limit) and
250 to assess the predictive ability to classify the individuals. The discriminant analysis aims
251 at better understanding group differences and at predicting the probability of an entity
252 (individual or object) to perceive a specific class or group, based on several independent
253 variables of the metrics [59]. Boedeker and Kearns [60] identified a better performance
254 by the discriminating analysis in comparison to many other techniques applied for the
255 same purpose. Besides, it allows determining the independent variable mostly
256 accounting for differences in mean score profiles in two or more groups [59].
257 Tabachnick and Fidell [61] added to this information by stating that the aim of the
258 discriminating analysis is to predict the group's participation based on a set of
259 predictors. Accordingly, it is possible confirming whether the groups formed from the
260 distribution process have properly classified individuals within the established limits.

261 Data were analyzed in statistic software Factor 12.01.01, SPSS v.23 and JASP
262 16.04.

263

264 **Results**

265 **Content validity evidences**

266 In total, 123 professionals from the five Brazilian regions joined the first stage of
267 the research to define the concept of "family vulnerability": 48.8% of them came from
268 Northeastern Brazil; 21.1% from Southeastern Brazil; 17.9% from Southern Brazil,

269 8.9% from Northern Brazil and 3.3% from Midwestern Brazil. Most professionals
270 belonged to the female sex (82.9%), approximately 40% of them had at least 10-year
271 experience in PHC and 48.8% reported to have specialization degree and higher
272 schooling profiles. Nurses were the professional category accounting for the highest
273 participation in this stage (48.3%); they were followed by Community Health Agents –
274 CHA – (10.7%). The first version of the instrument counted on 92 items; it was
275 developed from factors' responses that, at first, could be associated with the concept of
276 family vulnerability.

277 A panel of multi-regional and multi-disciplinary judges was set for the second
278 stage; it aimed at identifying content validity evidences. This panel comprised 73
279 judges: 61.7% from Southeastern Brazil, 15.1% from Southern Brazil, 9.6%
280 Northeastern Brazil, 6.8% from Northern Brazil and 6.8% from Midwestern Brazil.
281 Most of them belonged to the female sex (79.5%), more than half of them had less than
282 10-year experience in PHC (57.5%) and specialization as higher schooling profile
283 (51.4%). Nurses were the professional category accounting for the highest participation
284 in the panel (50.7%), they were followed by physicians (16.55). CVR was applied to
285 judges' answers. CVR critical value was established at $CVR > 0.12$, which was defined
286 based on the participation of 73 judges.

287 CVR calculation led to the exclusion of 54 items, and it resulted in scale version
288 comprising 38 items linked to socioeconomic and demographic aspects, access to
289 healthcare services, health condition and life style. In order to achieve a better
290 understanding of it, 12 of the 38 items were rewritten based on recommendations from
291 the panel of judges. It must be clear that only items 2 and 15 (Table 1) recorded CVR
292 lower than the critical value; therefore, their text was revised. The other 10 items did not
293 suffer any change; writing adjustments were made in the original text just to meet

294 CVR's critical value. The version presenting evidence of content validity (38 items) was
295 taken into consideration in the stage to evidence internal structure validity.

296 **Table 1. Items that remained in the scale after Content Validity Ratio (CVR) application.**

Item	Content Validity Ratio (CVR)			New text of the item
	Relevance	Clarity	Need of change ^a	
1. Is there lack of basic sanitation system in the neighborhood you live in?	0.12	0.12	0.78	Is there open sewer in your neighborhood?
2. Do you drink untreated water in your house?	0.12	0.07	0.86	Does the water in your house lack treatment?
3. Does your house face the risk of flood?	0.18	0.40	1.00	-
4. Do you live close to drug dealing areas?	0.12	0.40	0.95	-
5. Does anyone at your house live close to violent people?	0.21	0.32	0.97	-
6. Has anyone in your house been victim of violence?	0.26	0.34	1.00	-
7. Is there violence in your house?	0.23	0.32	1.00	-
8. Is anyone in your house in legal custody condition?	0.12	0.26	0.86	Is anyone in your Family in jail?
9. Is anyone in your house facing financial issues?	0.15	0.12	0.97	-
10. Does anyone lack money to fulfill household needs ?	0.12	0.21	0.97	-
11. Does anyone in your house is a <i>Bolsa Família</i> beneficiary?	0.12	0.32	1.00	-
12. Is anyone in your house a BPC (continued benefit)/LOAS (Social Security Organic Law) beneficiary?	0.15	0.21	0.86	Does anyone in your house get health benefit (BPC /LOAS)?
13. Have any health professional ever mentioned that someone in your house presents obesity?	0.12	0.15	0.86	-

14. Have any health professional ever mentioned that someone in your house suffers with malnutrition?	0.15	0.12	0.89	-
15. Is there any difficulty in making sure about food variety in your house?	0.15	0.10	0.92	It is hard to make sure about the access to different food types?
16. Does anyone in your house starve?	0.21	0.26	0.92	-
17. Does anyone in your house have drug addiction?	0.23	0.26	0.89	Does anyone in your house use illegal drugs?
18. Is anyone in your house an alcohol abuser?	0.23	0.26	0.92	-
19. Does anyone in your house use controlled medication?	0.15	0.37	0.95	-
20. Does anyone in your house use 5, or more, medications a day?	0.18	0.40	0.95	Does anyone in your house uses 5, or more, medications on a daily basis?
21. Does anyone in your house have a health condition that demands long-term caregiving?	0.21	0.26	0.97	Does anyone in your house have a health condition that requires continuous care?
22. Is anyone in your house impaired to perform daily activities?	0.18	0.23	0.86	-
23. Is anyone in your house helped by others to accomplish its own daily healthcare procedures?	0.15	0.21	0.95	Does anyone in your house need help to accomplish its own daily healthcare procedures?
24. Does anyone in your house present any disability?	0.12	0.37	1.00	-
25. Does anyone in your house have any intellectual/cognitive disability?	0.15	0.29	0.84	-
26. Does anyone in your house have mental issues?	0.21	0.34	1.00	-

27. Does anyone in your house have HIV/aids?	0.15	0.32	0.97	-
28. Is anyone in your house sick in bed?	0.15	0.32	1.00	-
29. Does anyone in your house often go to urgency and emergency units?	0.18	0.29	0.95	-
30. Does anyone in your house do not know the UBS/healthcare unit team in charge of your family?	0.15	0.32	0.95	-
31. Did anyone in your house have a child without wanting it?	0.15	0.29	0.95	Has anyone in your house had an unplanned child?
32. Did anyone in your house have a child before turning 20 years old?	0.12	0.37	0.97	-
33. Has anyone in your house had its mother absent in childhood?	0.18	0.34	1.00	-
34. Has anyone in your house had an absent father in the childhood?	0.12	0.32	1.00	-
35. Has anyone in your house faced abandonment by the family?	0.21	0.18	0.95	-
36. Are children in your house out of school?	0.12	0.32	0.92	Are there children in your house out of school?
37. Are there adolescents in your hose out of school?	0.12	0.37	0.97	Do you have any adolescent in your house out of school?
38. Are there under 14-year-old individuals in your house that have a job?	0.21	0.23	0.95	-
Mean CVR	0.16	0.27	0.94	-

297 ^a Accordingly, CVR values higher than the critical value point towards no need of changing the writings, although some items under this
298 condition were rewritten in order to improve semantics' adequacy.

299

300 **Evidences about internal structure validity**

301 In total, 1,584 users who attended the 11 PHC services during data collection
 302 were invited to join this research stage. However, only 1,505 (95%) of them accepted
 303 the invitation and signed the informed consent form. Only 1,255 of them completed the
 304 interview for the application of the scale version presenting content validity evidences.
 305 This sample represented the study's final sample and this version presented content
 306 validity evidences. Table 2 introduces participants' description of this study stage.

307 **Table 2. Participants' featuring.**

Variables (n=1255)	Categories	N (%)
Age in years ^a	-	43.3 (15.5%)
Sex (n=756)	Female	551 (43.9%)
	Male	205 (16.3%)
Race/skin color (n=1217)	White	386 (30.8%)
	Brown	640 (51.0%)
	Black	150 (12.0%)
	Yellow	23 (1.8%)
	Indigenous	18 (1.4%)
Schooling (in years) (n=1237)	0 to 4 years	160 (12.7%)
	5 to 8 years	225 (17.9%)
	9 to 11 years	247 (19.7%)
	12 to 15 years	480 (38.2%)
	Over 16 years	125 (10.0%)
Job (n=1237)	Unemployed or does not have a job	447 (35.6%)
	Employer	1 (0.1%)
	Self-employed without social security	111 (8.8%)
	Self-employed with social security	47 (3.7%)
	Wage owner	413 (32.9%)
	retired/pensioner	181 (14.4%)
	Others	37 (2.9%)
income (in minimum wage) ^b (n=726)	No income	58 (4.6%)
	Up to 1 minimum wage	327 (26.1%)

	> 1 and lower than 2 minimum wages	179 (14.3%)
	>= 2 and lower than 4 minimum wages	115 (9.2%)
	>= 4 lower than 10 minimum wages	31 (2.5%)
	>= 10 minimum wages	4 (0.3%)
	Does not know	12 (1.0%)
Number of children (n=759)	1 child	140 (11.2%)
	2 children	198 (15.8%)
	3 children	129 (10.3%)
	More than 3 children	129 (10.3%)
	Expecting the first child	19 (1.5%)
	Does not have children	144 (11.5%)
Number of households per room in the house (n=1223)	<1	406 (32.4%)
	1	697 (55.5%)
	>1	120 (9.6%)
Private healthcare insurance (n=1231)	Yes	180 (14.3%)
	No	1,051 (83.7%)
Systemic High Blood Pressure (n=1240)	Yes	212 (16.9%)
	No	1,028 (81.9%)
Diabetes Mellitus (n=1238)	Yes	96 (7.6%)
	No	1,142 (91%)
Cancer (current) (n=1237)	Yes	6 (0.5%)
	No	1,231 (98.1%)
Heart disease (n=1240)	Yes	72 (5.7%)
	No	1,168 (93.1%)
Intellectual/cognitive impairment (n=812)	Yes	15 (1.2%)
	No	797 (63.5%)
Tuberculosis (n=1240)	Yes	3 (0.2%)
	No	1,237 (98.6%)
Leprosy (n=1239)	Yes	1 (0.1%)
	No	1,238 (98.6%)
Kidney issues (n=1237)	Yes	35 (2.8%)
	No	1,202 (95.8%)
Breathing issues (n=1232)	Yes	96 (7.6%)
	No	1,136 (90.5%)
Mental issues diagnosis (n=1238)	Yes	30 (2.4%)
	No	1,208 (96.3%)

308 ^a continuous numerical variable described as mean and standard deviation.

309 ^b one minimum wage corresponds to R\$1,212.00 (in Brazilian Real, in 2022).

310 **Factorability**

311 The evaluation of sample adequacy measures is the first step of the factorability
312 analysis; it aims at assessing dataset factorability and whether factorial analyses are
313 applicable. Dataset's general data have shown good factorability: Fs recorded KMO
314 (0.75), Bartlett Sphericity = 6,084.6 (df = 91; $P < 0.0001$) and determinant of the matrix
315 = 0.00001. As for TrS: KMO (0.74), Bartlett Sphericity = 6,153.7 (df = 91; $P < 0.0001$)
316 and determinant of the matrix = 0.00001; TsS: KMO (0.71), Bartlett Sphericity =
317 2,617.3 (df = 91; $P < 0.0001$) and determinant of the matrix = 0.0002. Although general
318 indices presented good indicators, 4 of the 38 initial items have shown factorability
319 issues in three datasets (27 - Does anyone in your house have HIV/aids?; 36 - Are there
320 children in your house out of school?; 37 - Do you have any adolescent in your house
321 out of school?; and 38 - Are there under 14-year-old individuals in your house that have
322 a job?). They were excluded from the analyses based on recommendations by Lorenzo-
323 Seva and Ferrando [30].

324 **Dimensionability**

325 The first analyses were carried out in TrS. Dimensionality analyzed through
326 parallel analysis pointed towards a 4-dimension model. Closeness of dimensionality
327 values kept the indication for multi-dimensional model: Single = 0.82; ECV = 0.65 and
328 MIREAL = 0.37. Thirteen (13) of the 34 items forming the initial analysis did not
329 present substantial factorial load in the model. Accordingly, the process to remove items
330 in order to adjust the model followed two principles: quantitative (statistical adjustment)
331 and qualitative (interpretability) adjustment. The choice for removing an item was
332 carried out by taking into consideration the set of primary indicators: factorial load,
333 communality, Eta of Pratt's Importance Measure, existence of cross-loading, Heywood
334 case and model adjustment indices. The items were removed from the scale up to the

335 time the two principles were congruent to each other, and it resulted in a model for 4-
336 dimension TrS, with 14 items with proper statistical adjustment, open for
337 interpretability. The parallel analysis kept on pointing out a 4-dimension solution and
338 explained variance of 78.66%. This model was replicated in TsS and FS. Both datasets
339 confirmed the 4-dimension model; furthermore, the closeness of dimensionality values
340 reinforced the multi-dimensional model (Table 3) for the three datasets.

341 **Table 3. Items' I-Unico, I-ECV and I-Real values**

Item	I-UNICO			I-ECV			I-REAL		
	TrS	TsS	FS	TrS	TsS	FS	TrS	TsS	FS
1. Is anyone in your house facing financial issues?	1.000	0.958	1.000	0.991	0.770	0.984	0.063	0.352	0.084
2. Do you lack money to fulfill household needs?	1.000	0.931	1.000	0.996	0.719	0.990	0.038	0.389	0.061
3. It is hard to make sure about access to different food types?	1.000	0.988	1.000	0.976	0.865	0.992	0.094	0.232	0.051
4. Does anyone in your house use controlled medication?	0.957	0.983	0.970	0.766	0.844	0.799	0.328	0.275	0.322
5. Does anyone in your house use 5, or more medications, on a daily basis?	0.662	0.988	0.926	0.469	0.863	0.711	0.491	0.261	0.361
6. Does anyone in your house have a health condition that requires continuous care?	0.927	0.968	0.963	0.711	0.795	0.782	0.449	0.383	0.371
7. Is anyone in your house impaired to perform daily activities?	0.850	0.966	0.941	0.617	0.789	0.735	0.560	0.400	0.431
8. Does anyone in your house need help to accomplish its own daily healthcare procedures?	0.742	0.961	0.887	0.525	0.777	0.657	0.538	0.378	0.471
9. Did anyone in your house have its mother absent in childhood?	0.291	0.347	0.387	0.233	0.270	0.295	0.600	0.493	0.511
10. Did anyone in your house have an absent father in childhood?	0.495	0.240	0.511	0.363	0.198	0.373	0.465	0.535	0.381
11. Has anyone in your house faced abandonment by the family?	0.927	0.583	0.912	0.711	0.418	0.690	0.329	0.439	0.291
12. Does anyone in your house live close to violent people?	0.868	0.936	0.488	0.636	0.727	0.358	0.481	0.115	0.611
13. Have anyone in your house been victim of violence?	0.861	0.914	0.731	0.628	0.693	0.517	0.450	0.295	0.561
14. Is there violence in your house?	0.914	0.963	0.349	0.692	0.782	0.272	0.381	0.021	0.501

I-UNICO, Unidimensional Congruence; I-ECV, Explained Common Variance; I-REAL, Residual Absolute Loadings; TrS, Training Sample; TsS, Test Sample; FS, Full Sample.

342

343 TrS primary data (Table 4) presented factorial data ranging from 0.597 to 0.975,
344 communality ranging from 0.449 to 0.967, and Eta ranging from 0.640 to 0.941. The
345 model recorded explained variable of 76.18%. Items 1 and 3 comprised dimension
346 **Income**, items from 4 to 8 comprised dimension **Healthcare**, dimension **Family** was in
347 items 9 to 11, and the single dimension called **Violence** was observed in items 12 to 14.
348 Accordingly, the model points towards good factorial and interpretable (quantitatively)
349 solution, with content alignment in coherent and interpretable (quantitatively) items.
350 The final version of the scale represented reduction by approximately 63% in the 38
351 items assessed through judges' panel in the first stage. This value is close to that
352 presented by DeVellis [28], according to whom the researcher must project items lost by
353 50% throughout the process.

354 Based on the four dimensions composing the scale, it is possible taking into
355 account the key role played by social determinants within the health/illness process.
356 Dimensions embody items related to income, social and family cohesion, and to life and
357 housing conditions associated with psychosocial and behavioral aspects [62]. Thus, it
358 extrapolates the biological view of health, which is overall acknowledged in a
359 reductionist way, centered in medical practices [62-65]. Nevertheless, the present
360 instrument emerges as multi-disciplinary work-tool available for PHC teams that have
361 the potential to promote social justice by taking into consideration social inequities at
362 the time to plan healthcare services.

363 **Table 4. Training dataset: Factorial loads, communality and Eta.**

Item	Factorial Load				h ²	Pratt's Measure - (Eta)			
	Income	Healthcare	Family	Violence		Income	Healthcare	Family	Violence
1. Is anyone in your house facing financial issues?	0.893	0.027	-0.012	0.059	0.849	0.904	0.098	0.000	0.146
2. Do you lack money to fulfill household needs?	0.895	-0.013	0.013	-0.067	0.762	0.872	0.000	0.049	0.000
3. Is there any difficulty in making sure about food variety in your house?	0.597	0.091	0.102	0.110	0.516	0.642	0.180	0.174	0.203
4. Does anyone in your house use controlled medication?	-0.100	0.693	0.101	0.067	0.500	0.000	0.680	0.146	0.130
5. Does anyone in your house use 5, or more, medications on a daily basis?	-0.080	0.711	0.031	-0.118	0.449	0.000	0.668	0.051	0.000
6. Does anyone in your house have a health condition that requires continuous care?	-0.032	0.805	0.020	0.069	0.671	0.000	0.805	0.059	0.139
7. Is anyone in your house impaired to perform daily activities?	0.094	0.862	-0.131	0.029	0.798	0.189	0.869	0.000	0.084
8. Does anyone in your house need help to accomplish its own daily healthcare procedures?	0.062	0.737	-0.053	-0.090	0.540	0.132	0.723	0.000	0.000
9. Did anyone in your house have its mother absent in childhood?	0.012	-0.140	0.798	0.013	0.630	0.042	0.000	0.790	0.061
10. Did anyone in your house have its father absent in childhood?	0.056	-0.033	0.741	-0.097	0.514	0.099	0.000	0.710	0.000
11. Has anyone in your house faced abandonment by the family?	0.018	0.148	0.630	0.073	0.504	0.065	0.203	0.658	0.163
12. Does anyone in your house live close to violent people?	0.192	-0.130	-0.108	0.975	0.967	0.284	0.000	0.000	0.941
13. Have anyone in your house been victim of violence?	-0.118	0.086	0.290	0.605	0.574	0.000	0.146	0.379	0.640
14. Is there violence in your house?	-0.124	0.055	-0.091	0.937	0.787	0.000	0.117	0.000	0.880

364

365 Factorial loads recorded for the TsS dataset (Table 5) ranged from 0.643 to
366 0.976, communality ranged from 0.482 to 0.910 and Eta ranged from 0.658 to 0.951.
367 This model presented explained variance of 76.18%. Once again, the observed model
368 was equal to the training dataset model; consequently, it was quantitatively and
369 qualitatively interpretable.

370 **Table 5. Test dataset: Factor loading, communality and Eta**

Item	Factorial Load				h ²	Pratt's Measure - (Eta)			
	Income	Healthcare	Family	Violence		Income	Healthcare	Family	Violence
1. Is anyone in your house facing financial issues?	0.801	0.032	0.046	0.056	0.702	0.818	0.108	0.128	0.075
2. Do you lack money to fulfill household needs?	0.976	-0.072	0.013	-0.008	0.910	0.951	0.000	0.068	0.000
3. Is there any difficulty in making sure about food variety in your house?	0.805	0.063	-0.084	-0.006	0.647	0.790	0.151	0.000	0.000
4. Does anyone in your house use controlled medication?	0.059	0.671	-0.009	-0.006	0.482	0.138	0.681	0.000	0.000
5. Does anyone in your house use 5, or more, medications on a daily basis?	0.141	0.639	-0.078	0.066	0.493	0.227	0.658	0.000	0.094
6. Does anyone in your house have a health condition that requires continuous care?	-0.047	0.882	0.023	-0.012	0.753	0.000	0.865	0.063	0.000
7. Is anyone in your house impaired to perform daily activities?	0.001	0.881	-0.030	0.011	0.770	0.015	0.876	0.000	0.035
8. Does anyone in your house need help to accomplish its own daily healthcare procedures?	-0.080	0.856	0.037	-0.033	0.690	0.000	0.827	0.078	0.000
9. Did anyone in your house have its mother absent in childhood?	-0.024	-0.030	0.727	0.036	0.514	0.000	0.000	0.715	0.059
10. Did anyone in your house have its father absent in childhood?	-0.015	-0.090	0.752	0.037	0.546	0.000	0.000	0.736	0.059
11. Has anyone in your house faced abandonment by the family?	-0.035	0.077	0.757	-0.062	0.575	0.000	0.123	0.748	0.000
12. Does anyone in your house live close to violent people?	0.067	-0.016	-0.037	0.918	0.843	0.076	0.000	0.000	0.915
13. Have anyone in your house been victim of violence?	0.138	0.096	0.310	0.643	0.652	0.211	0.164	0.370	0.666
14. Is there violence in your house?	-0.177	-0.041	-0.172	0.923	0.893	0.196	0.042	0.167	0.909

371

372 These results ranged from 0.308 to 0.785 for factorial loads, from 0.212 to 0.967
373 for communality, and Eta ranged from 0.640 to 0.941. The model based on the total
374 sample recorded explained variance of 79.02%. Number of dimensions' stability and
375 model interpretability are essential aspects of dimensionality. It reinforces the relevance
376 of carrying out the cross-validation.

377 **Table 6. Full dataset: Factor loading, communality and Eta.**

Item	Factorial load				h ²	Pratt's Measure - (Eta)			
	Income	Healthcare	Family	Violence		Income	Healthcare	Family	Violence
1. Is anyone in your house facing financial issues?	0.733	0.009	0.004	0.023	0.548	0.736	0.049	0.029	0.047
2. Do you lack money to fulfill household needs?	0.785	-0.045	-0.015	-0.020	0.585	0.765	0.000	0.000	0.000
3. Is there any difficulty in making sure about food variety in your house?	0.555	0.059	0.019	0.027	0.346	0.569	0.124	0.060	0.050
4. Does anyone in your house use controlled medication?	-0.001	0.523	0.056	0.016	0.287	0.000	0.528	0.087	0.035
5. Does anyone in your house use 5, or more, medications a day?	0.019	0.489	-0.012	-0.010	0.243	0.060	0.489	0.000	0.000
6. Does anyone in your house have a health condition that requires continuous care?	0.007	0.639	0.032	0.013	0.421	0.041	0.644	0.065	0.032
7. Is anyone in your house impaired to perform daily activities?	0.008	0.723	-0.048	0.001	0.518	0.044	0.718	0.000	0.008
8. Does anyone in your house need help to accomplish its own daily healthcare procedures?	-0.036	0.624	-0.017	-0.024	0.371	0.000	0.609	0.000	0.000
9. Did anyone in your house have its mother absent in childhood?	-0.027	-0.049	0.594	0.004	0.339	0.000	0.000	0.582	0.013
10. Did anyone in your house have an absent father in childhood?	0.009	-0.043	0.552	-0.009	0.302	0.037	0.000	0.548	0.000
11. Has anyone in your house faced abandonment by the family?	0.004	0.060	0.471	0.001	0.236	0.026	0.089	0.476	0.007
12. Does anyone in your house live close to violent people?	0.025	-0.034	0.011	0.743	0.554	0.047	0.000	0.029	0.742
13. Has anyone in your house been victim of violence?	0.028	0.084	0.273	0.308	0.212	0.069	0.119	0.296	0.325
14. Is there violence in your house?	-0.047	-0.005	-0.018	0.597	0.351	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.593

378

379 Reliability indices between analysis datasets ranged from 0.69 to 0.71 in
380 Cronbach's alpha, it reached 0.70 in the three dataset for Omega, it ranged from 0.83 to
381 0.84 for glb and from 0.80 to 0.96 ORION, between dimensions and datasets. Factorial
382 solution quality indices also showed adequate levels, and this finding reinforced the
383 model's stability (Table 7). Accordingly, the set of applied techniques and indices
384 pointed towards a set of internal structure validity evidences that are adequate,
385 consistent, robust and interpretable.

386 **Table 7. Synthesis of the models**

Synthesis	Index	Technique	Training Sample (TrS)	Test Sample (TsS)	Full Sample (FS)
Exploratory	Adequacy of correlation matrix	Determinant of the matrix	< 0.000001	< 0.000001	0.0002
		Bartlett	6084.6 (df = 91)	6153.7 (df = 91)	8936.7
		KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin)	0.75	0.74	0.71
		Explained Variance (AP)	77.73%	76.18%	79.02%
		Polychoric Correlation ($r_p =$)	-0.08 to 0.80	-0.21 to 0.81	-0.04 to 0.82
Reliability		Cronbach's Alpha	0.69	0.71	0.71
		McDonald's Omega	0.70	0.70	0.70
		Greatest Lower Bound – glb	0.83	0.84	0.83
		ORION ^a	0.90; 0.96; 0.80; 0.91	0.81; 0.91; 0.93; 0.93	0.80; 0.93; 0.90; 0.92
Unidimensional Assessment		Unidimensional Congruence (UNICO)	0.82	0.83	0.79
		Explained Common Variance (ECV)	0.65	0.70	0.66
		Mean of item residual absolute loading (MIREAL)	0.37	0.32	0.36
Quality and Effectiveness		Factor Determinacy Index (FDI) ^a	0.94; 0.98; 0.89; 0.95	0.90; 0.95; 0.96; 0.96	0.89; 0.96; 0.95; 0.95
		Sensitivity Ratio (SR) ^a	3.02; 5.37; 2.04; 3.20	2.09; 3.29; 3.77; 3.90	2.00; 3.74; 3.11; 3.37
		Expected percentage of true differences (EPTD) ^a	92.6%; 96.6%; 88.9%; 93.0%	89.1%; 93.3%; 94.3%; 94.6%	88.7%; 94.2%; 92.8%; 93.5%

^a from dimension 1 to 4, respectively

387 **Standardization**

388 The internal structure of the instrument was extrapolated and found. Now, the
389 descriptive study and score standardization will be addressed to allow instrument
390 interpretability and participants' proper classification based on the scores. Accordingly,
391 Table 8 depicts the frequency of answers to items in the questionnaire. There was clear
392 prevalence of "No" answers for all items in the instrument. Some items presented
393 higher frequency of "yes" answers: "Lack of money to fulfill household needs"
394 (40.34%), "someone in the house uses controlled medication" (36.41%), "someone in
395 the house has a health condition that requires continuous care" (36.77%) and "someone
396 in the house had an absent father in childhood" (34.07%).

397 **Table 8. Frequency of answers for the items.**

Item	Frequency of answer to the item (N/%)		
	No	Yes	Missing
1. Is anyone in your house facing financial issues?	870 (69.10)	377 (29.94)	12 (0.95)
2. Do you lack money to fulfill household needs?	742 (58.93)	508 (40.34)	9 (0.71)
3. Is there any difficulty in making sure about food variety in your house?	928 (73.70)	322 (25.57)	9 (0.71)
4. Does anyone in your house use controlled medication?	793 (62.98)	461 (36.61)	5 (0.39)
5. Does anyone in your house use 5, or more, medications a day?	1,020 (81.01)	231 (18.34)	8 (0.63)
6. Does anyone in your house have a health condition that requires continuous care?	788 (62.58)	463 (36.77)	8 (0.63)
7. Is anyone in your house impaired to perform daily activities?	1,026 (81.43)	232 (18.42)	1 (0.07)
8. Does anyone in your house need help to accomplish its own daily healthcare procedures?	1,066 (84.67)	190 (15.09)	3 (0.23)
9. Did anyone in your house have its mother absent in childhood?	1,048 (83.24)	207 (16.44)	4 (0.31)
10. Did anyone in your house have an absent father in childhood?	826 (65.60)	429 (34.07)	4 (0.31)
11. Has anyone in your house faced abandonment by the family?	1,129 (89.67)	125 (9.92)	5 (0.39)
12. Does anyone in your house live close to violent people?	1,221 (96.98)	34 (2.70)	4 (0.31)
13. Has anyone in your house been victim of violence?	1,088 (86.41)	167 (13.26)	4 (0.31)
14. Is there violence in your house?	1,232 (97.85)	25 (1.98)	2 (0.15)

398

399 Table 9 presents the scores recorded for the dimensions and the general score of
400 the Family Vulnerability Scale. All dimensions had all their amplitudes answered.
401 Dimensions Income, Family and Violence recorded median = 0, Healthcare showed
402 median = 1 and total score recorded median = 2. An interesting aspect of the total score
403 lies on the fact that amplitude ranged from 0 to 14 and the maximum score recorded in
404 the current sample reached 12. Medians in the minimum limit, and close to it,
405 previously pointed out that the instrument can accurately differentiate individuals who
406 are eventually facing family vulnerability situations.

407 **Table 9. Description of dimensions and scores recorded for the Family**
408 **Vulnerability Scale.**

Dimension / Score	Central Trend Measurements and Dispersion				
	Median	Minimum	Maximum	Amplitude	Interquartile
Income dimension	0.00	0.00	3	3	2.00
Healthcare dimension	1.00	0.00	5	5	2.00
Family dimension	0.00	0.00	3	3	1.00
Violence Dimension	0.00	0.00	3	3	0.00
Total Score Total	2.00	0.00	12	12	3.00

409

410 Because these scores are closer to the minimum limit, they only started
411 presenting greater difference when they got far from the median that, in this case, was
412 close to the minimum; therefore, in the upper quartile. Thus, three initial classifications
413 were suggested: model 1 had cut in the median (low and high vulnerability), model 2
414 scores were separated until percentile 75, from 76 to 89, and higher than 90; model 3
415 scores were separated up to percentile 70, from 70 to 89, or higher.

416 The discriminant analysis of each classification developed to assess whether it
417 was possible accurately identifying participants within the limit was applied after the
418 first cuts were made.

419 The first analysis adopted a binary classification (low and high). The
420 discriminant analysis showed $MBox = 446.58$ $p < 0.001$. $\lambda_{\text{wilks}} = 0.36$; $F_{(1, 1257)} =$
421 $1,268.77$; $p < 0.001$; canonical correlation = 0.797 ; the model with two limits properly
422 classified 85.7% of the cases. The discriminant analysis applied to model 2 was $MBox$
423 $= 49.64$ $p < 0.001$. $\lambda_{\text{wilks}} = 0.18$; $F_{(2, 1256)} = 2,094.25$; $p < 0.001$; canonical correlation =
424 0.907 . Model 2 properly classified 100% of cases. The analysis applied to model 3
425 presented $MBox = 49.64$ $p < 0.001$. $\lambda_{\text{wilks}} = 0.25$; $F_{(2, 1256)} = 1,838.71$; $p < 0.001$;
426 canonical correlation = 0.863 ; it was possible properly classifying 89% of cases. The
427 recommended classification and scores interpretations are depicted in Table 10.

428 **Table 10. Limits, classification and interpretation of Family Vulnerability Scale**
429 **scores**

Classification results	Percentile	Name	Score
Limit	Up to 75	low	0 to 4
	76 to 89	Moderate	5 to 6
	Higher than 90	High	Higher than 7

430

431 **Family Vulnerability Scale – final version**

432 The final version of the Family Vulnerability scale (EVFAM-BR) comprised 14
433 items (or questions) applied to each family in the PHC territory in Brazil, due to the
434 action by Community Health Agents (CHA). EVFAM-BR has four dimensions; each
435 one of them has a score corresponding to the number of items in the dimension – at the
436 end of its application, the score must range from zero (0) to fourteen (14). Healthcare is

437 the dimension accounting for the largest number of items; consequently, it has the
438 greatest potential in the scale (n=5). The final EVFAM-BR presented three family
439 vulnerability classification limits if one sums the scores of each dimension: Low (0 to
440 4), Moderate (5 to 6) and High (7 to 14). Table 11 presents a summary of the Family
441 Vulnerability Scale, and its respective dimensions, items and scores.

442 **Table 11. Family Vulnerability Scale (EVFAM-BR).**

Dimension	Item	Item score	Dimension score
Income	1. Is anyone in your house facing financial issues?	1	3
	2. Do you lack money to fulfill household needs?	1	
	3. Is there any difficulty in making sure about food variety in your house?	1	
Healthcare	4. Does anyone in your house use controlled medication?	1	5
	5. Does anyone in your house use 5, or more, medications on a daily basis?	1	
	6. Does anyone in your house have a health condition that requires continuous care?	1	
	7. Is anyone in your house impaired to perform daily activities?	1	
Family	8. Does anyone in your house need help to accomplish its own daily healthcare procedures?	1	3
	9. Did anyone in your house have its mother absent in childhood?	1	
	10. Did anyone in your house have an absent father in childhood?	1	
Violence	11. Has anyone in your house faced abandonment by the family?	1	3
	12. Does anyone in your house live close to violent people?	1	
	13. Has anyone in your house been victim of violence?	1	
	14. Is there violence in your house?	1	
Total		14	14

443

444 **Discussion**

445 The Family Vulnerability Scale (EVFAM-BR) has shown evidences of content
446 and internal structure validity based on the multi-regional and multi-professional
447 context, and this finding allows measuring family vulnerability in Brazil.

448 EVFAM-BR comprises 14 items distributed into the following dimensions:
449 Income, Healthcare, Family and Violence. It is worth highlighting that EVFAM-BR
450 aims at measuring social vulnerability within the family context; consequently, all items
451 refer to the family nucleus, they are not oriented to one specific resident, or to the
452 respondent, itself.

453 Just to exemplify EVFAM-BR application to a family in a given local or time:
454 one of the residents in a given house is facing financial issues. However, lack of money
455 to fulfill household needs is not identified and there is no hard time accessing different
456 food types; one of the residents has a chronic disease that requires continuous care and
457 uses controlled medication (less than 5 medication types a day), but none of the
458 residents has any difficulty in performing daily activities and does not need daily
459 healthcare; none of the residents lacked mother or father presence in childhood and no
460 family member faced abandonment situations; there was no violence in the house and
461 no one in the house lives with violent people, but one of the residents was a victim of
462 violence. Given the positive answers to items financial issue by one of the residents (1),
463 health condition requiring continuous care (1), the use of medication (1) and person
464 who was violence victim (1), this family would reach score 4, and – based on the
465 classification limit of EVFAM-BR final score - it represents a family classified as “low
466 family vulnerability”.

467 The literature consistently states that income is a relevant social health
468 determinant and that it must be taken into account to allow planning equitable
469 healthcare provision [66]. The subsequent discussion about this topic led to different
470 views on how income inequality affects health. Rich or poor individuals, in low social
471 cohesion societies, would be the target of problems such as crime, lack of public
472 investments, and it makes people adopt unhealthy behaviors such as smoking, excessive
473 alcohol consumption and sedentary life [67]. These outcomes can help better
474 understanding the relationship between variables linked to income and enable
475 interventions at macroeconomic level, as well as assessing these changes in population
476 health.

477 The healthcare dimension is timely, given the accelerated population aging in
478 the country and abroad, a fact that demands healthcare services' reorganization to
479 continuously fulfill population needs, in an organized way, based on quality and safety.
480 With respect to the family dimension, several studies have shown the association
481 between absence of parents and different health outcomes, among them one finds
482 cognitive development loss [68,69], impacts on mental health [70,71], and early
483 development of risk behavior for health, such as smoking and alcohol abuse [72].

484 Finally, dimension "violence" corroborated the discussion observed in WHO's
485 2030 agenda for the sustainable development of millennium goals; this agenda
486 highlights violence prevention as fundamental component for both development and
487 improved quality of life, worldwide. It is known that violence affects health and
488 broadens the demands for healthcare in a way wider than simply through initial trauma,
489 it extrapolates the probability of other important causes for diseases and death [73]. It is
490 possible identifying association among exposure to violence, undesired health outcomes

491 and unhealthy behaviors, such as drug and alcohol abuse, mainly among low-income
492 mothers in urban locations [74].

493 Although the urgency in having research focused on low and medium income countries
494 that account for 90% of the global violence, only 10% of studies in this field are
495 performed in them [73]. Thus, EVFAM-BR emerges as a tool to allow structurally and
496 routinely introducing the approach of social factors associated with the health/illness
497 process in healthcare services, in developing countries.

498 Accordingly, EVFARM-BR validity evidences, along with the four family
499 vulnerability strata proposed based on its application, present the potential of this tool to
500 help the role played by PHCs in performing their attributes, mainly in coordinating
501 caregiving based on population-base management within the community and family
502 context [75].

503 It is important highlighting that EVFAM-BR is an instrument presenting robust
504 and synthesized evidences that, at first, demand low workload investment by
505 professionals and low financial resources. Because it is an objective instrument (only
506 “yes” and “no” answers are expected), it suggests that all PHC professionals must be
507 trained to use it. This instrument emerges as powerful tool to support the work by
508 community health agents (CHA), since these actors are community members and are
509 closely bond to families in the territory; this process makes the “interview environment”
510 more comfortable and trustful for users who answer the questions on behalf of the
511 household. Thus, EVFAM-BR can be applied through printed materials or, yet, online,
512 since it is a tool used as work instrument added to the teams’ routine. One must take
513 into account its potential for inclusion in the digital registration system of the Brazilian
514 Unified Health System (SUS).

515 It is possible guiding the teams at the time to plan their actions and health
516 interventions (based on exposing families to conditions that increase vulnerability and
517 risk to develop illnesses) by applying EVFAM-BR and by interpreting its household-
518 classification results based on the four predicted strata. It is worth highlighting how
519 vulnerability contexts can be changed overtime; instrument application must be
520 periodical to keep teams' planning updated, according to population needs.

521 Among limitations of the current study, one finds sampling based on
522 convenience. It does not ensure statistical results' reliability. However, the study was
523 carried out in different socioeconomic, demographic and cultural contexts, since it
524 encompassed participants from the five geographic regions in Brazil. Yet, it is important
525 pointing out the potential of carrying out research in the PHC context in order to allow
526 the participation of people with different demands, needs and life conditions, who seek
527 care in this service.

528 Highlights in the present research are data collection by professionals outside the
529 assessed services who were trained to carry out the interviews, as well as the use of
530 robust techniques to identify EVFAM-BR validity evidences; among them, CVR
531 presents a sophisticated and more adequate method [76] in comparison to the proposed
532 alternatives [77]. CVR calculation takes into consideration the number of judges [24,25]
533 and it minimizes the increase in random compliance [24], a fact that allows adopting a
534 large number of judges to judge the instrument. The adoption of a multi-disciplinary
535 panel of judges comprising researchers, translators, health professionals, methodology
536 experts and lay people leads to more consistent results from the judges' panel [77-79].

537 It is important pinpointing the need of implementing research in order to identify
538 the potential and challenges of using EVFAM-BR in the routine of PCH's services in
539 different Brazilian contexts and, yet, in countries presenting similar health system

540 features, as well as population socioeconomic, demographic, sanitary and
541 epidemiological features.

542

543 **Conclusion**

544 Given the set of herein employed techniques, it is possible stating that the set of
545 content validity and EVFAM-BR internal structure evidences are adequate, consistent,
546 reliable and robust, as well as that the cross-validation method ensured model reliability
547 and replicability. A synthetic scale was presented, and it is capable of accurately
548 measuring and differentiating familiar vulnerability.

549

550 **References**

- 551 1. Carmo ME, Guizardi FL. O conceito de vulnerabilidade e seus sentidos para as
552 políticas públicas de saúde e assistência social. Cad. Saude Publica [Internet].
553 2018 [cited 2022 Nov 22];34(3):e00101417. DOI [https://doi.org/10.1590/0102-](https://doi.org/10.1590/0102-311X00101417)
554 311X00101417. Available at:
555 [https://www.scielo.br/j/csp/a/ywYD8gCqRGg6RrNmsYn8WHv/abstract/?lang=](https://www.scielo.br/j/csp/a/ywYD8gCqRGg6RrNmsYn8WHv/abstract/?lang=pt#)
556 [pt#](https://www.scielo.br/j/csp/a/ywYD8gCqRGg6RrNmsYn8WHv/abstract/?lang=pt#)
- 557 2. Ferreira JBB, Santos LL, Ribeiro LC, Fracon BRR, Wong S. Vulnerability and
558 Primary Health Care: An Integrative Literature Review. J Prim Care Community
559 Health [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022 Dec 21];12 DOI
560 10.1177/21501327211049705. Available from:
561 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34654333/>
- 562 3. Oviedo RAM, Czeresnia D. conceito de vulnerabilidade e seu caráter biossocial.
563 Interface [Internet]. 2015 [cited 2022 Nov 22];19(53):237-250. DOI

- 564 <https://doi.org/10.1590/1807-57622014.0436>. Available at:
565 <https://www.scielo.br/j/icse/a/5BDdb5z4hWMNn58drsSzktF/abstract/?lang=pt#>
- 566 4. Ayres JRCM, Calazans GJ, Saletti Filho HC, França Junior I. Risco,
567 vulnerabilidade e práticas de prevenção e promoção da saúde. In: Campos GWS,
568 Bonfim JRA, Minayo MCS, Akerman M, Drumond Junior M, Carvalho YM
569 (eds) orgs. Tratado de Saúde Coletiva. Hucitec Editora; 2016;399-442.
- 570 5. Ayres JRCM, França Junior I, Calazans GJ, Saletti Filho HC. O conceito de
571 vulnerabilidade e as práticas de saúde: novas perspectivas e desafios. In:
572 Czeresnia D, Freitas CM, editors. Promoção da saúde: conceitos, reflexões,
573 tendências. Rio de Janeiro: Fiocruz; 2003.; p. 117-139.
- 574 6. Ayres JRCM, Paiva V, França Junior I, Gravato N, Lacerda R, Negra MD, et al.
575 Vulnerability, human rights, and comprehensive health care needs of young
576 people living with HIV/AIDS. Am J Public Health [Internet]. 2006 [cited 2022
577 Nov 14];96(6):1001-1006. DOI 10.2105/AJPH.2004.060905. Available at:
578 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16449593/>
- 579 7. Silva TMR, Alvarenga MRM, Oliveira MAC. Evaluation of the vulnerability of
580 families assisted in primary care in Brazil. Rev Lat Am Enfermagem [Internet].
581 2012 [cited 2022 Dec 21];20(5):935-43. DOI 10.1590/s0104-
582 11692012000500016. Available from:
583 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23174839/>
- 584 8. Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo (PNUD), editor. La
585 reducción de riesgos de desastres: un desafío para el desarrollo [bibliography on
586 the Internet]. New York: Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo;
587 2004 [cited 2022 Nov 22]. Available at:

- 588 https://unici.gnomio.com/pluginfile.php/18234/mod_folder/content/0/3.25_undp
589 [_rdr_esp.pdf?forcedownload=1](https://unici.gnomio.com/pluginfile.php/18234/mod_folder/content/0/3.25_undp_rdr_esp.pdf?forcedownload=1)
- 590 9. Ayuso IA, Vargas EC. Índice de Vulnerabilidad Social en los países de la
591 OCDE. Quivera [Internet]. 2006 [cited 2022 Nov 22];8(2):248-274. Available
592 at: <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/401/40180212.pdf>
- 593 10. Hidalgo-Troya A, Guerrero-Díaz GF, Estupiñan-Ferrín VL, Rocha-Buelvas A.
594 Índice de vulnerabilidad de los hogares en el municipio de Pasto, Colombia,
595 2012. Cad Saude Publica [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2022 Nov 14];33(3):e00122315.
596 DOI 10.1590/0102-311X00122315. Available at:
597 <https://www.scielo.br/j/csp/a/FP5Mfs5srgx6CMKX7hf7GGd/?lang=es>
- 598 11. Savassi LCM, Lage JL, Coelho FLG. Sistematização de um instrumento de
599 estratificação de risco familiar: Escala de risco familiar de Coelho-Savassi. J
600 Manag Prim Health Care [Internet]. 2012 [cited 2022 Nov 14];3(2):179-185.
601 DOI <https://doi.org/10.14295/jmphc.v3i2.155>. Available at:
602 <https://www.jmphc.com.br/jmphc/article/view/155>
- 603 12. Amendola F, Alvarenga MRM, Gaspar JC, Yamashita CH, Oliveira MAC.
604 Validade aparente de um índice de vulnerabilidade das famílias a incapacidade e
605 dependência. Rev Esc Enferm USP [Internet]. 2011 [cited 2022 Nov
606 14];45(spe2):1736-1742. DOI [https://doi.org/10.1590/S0080-
607 62342011000800017](https://doi.org/10.1590/S0080-62342011000800017). Available at:
608 [https://www.scielo.br/j/reeusp/a/WN3Xh9ySynhWsQmKr6zbQVH/abstract/?lan
609 g=pt](https://www.scielo.br/j/reeusp/a/WN3Xh9ySynhWsQmKr6zbQVH/abstract/?lang=pt)
- 610 13. Amendola F, Alvarenga MRM, Latorre MRDO, Oliveira MAC. Development
611 and validation of the Family Vulnerability Index to Disability and Dependence
612 (FVI-DD). Rev Esc Enferm USP [Internet]. 2014 [cited 2022 Nov 14];48(1):82-

- 613 90. DOI 10.1590/S0080-623420140000100010. Available at:
614 <https://www.scielo.br/j/reeusp/a/GHNyt8QQbG7FxxhFNBWzthpB/?format=pdf>
615 <https://www.scielo.br/j/reeusp/a/GHNyt8QQbG7FxxhFNBWzthpB/?format=pdf>
&lang=en
- 616 14. Amendola F, Alvarenga MRM, Latorre MRDO, Oliveira MAC. Índice de
617 vulnerabilidade a incapacidades e dependência (IVF-ID), segundo condições
618 sociais e de saúde. Cien Saude Colet [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2022 Nov
619 14];22(6):2063-2071. DOI 10.1590/1413-81232017226.03432016. Available at:
620 <https://www.scielo.br/j/csc/a/jtCXRphGrsGjLSTpMsqzZjC/?lang=pt>
- 621 15. Associação Brasileira de Empresas de Pesquisa - ABEP [Internet]. [place
622 unknown]; 2018. Critério Brasil 2018; [cited 2022 Nov 14]; Available at:
623 <https://www.abep.org/criterio-brasil>
- 624 16. American Psychological Association - APA [Internet]. Washington: American
625 Educational Research Association (AERA), American Psychological
626 Association (APA), National Council on Measurement in Education (NCME);
627 2014. The Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing; [cited 2022
628 Nov 14]; Available at: <https://www.apa.org/science/programs/testing/standards>
- 629 17. Biernacki P, Waldorf D. Snowball Sampling—Problems and Techniques of
630 Chain Referral Sampling. Sociol Methods Res [Internet]. 1981 [cited 2022 Nov
631 14];10(2):141-163. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1177/00491241810100020>. Available
632 at: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/004912418101000205>
- 633 18. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research
634 electronic data capture (REDCap)—a metadata-driven methodology and
635 workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. J
636 Biomed Inform [Internet]. 2009 [cited 2022 Nov 14];42(2):377-381. DOI

- 637 10.1016/j.jbi.2008.08.010. Available at:
638 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18929686/>
- 639 19. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, Elliott V, Fernandez M, O'Neal L, et al. The
640 REDCap consortium: Building an international community of software platform
641 partners. J Biomed Inform [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2022 Nov 14];95:103208. DOI
642 10.1016/j.jbi.2019.103208. Available at:
643 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31078660/>
- 644 20. Schönholzer TE, Pinto IC, Zacharias FCM, Gaete RAC, Serrano-Gallardo MDP.
645 Implementation of the e-SUS Primary Care system: Impact on the routine of
646 Primary Health Care professionals. Rev Lat Am Enfermagem [Internet]. 2021
647 [cited 2022 Nov 15];19(29):e3447. DOI 10.1590/1518-8345.4174.3447.
648 Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34287545/>
- 649 21. Brazil. Ministry of Health. e-SUS APS [Internet]. Brasília: Ministry of Health;
650 2022 [cited 2022 Nov 15]. Available at: <https://sisaps.saude.gov.br/esus/>
- 651 22. Bardin L. Análise de Conteúdo. 2010th ed. Lisboa: Edições 70; 1977. 225 p.
652 ISBN: 978-972-44-1154-5.
- 653 23. Lawshe CH. A quantitative approach to content validity. Pers Psychol.
654 1975;28(4):563-575.
- 655 24. Baghestani AR, Ahmadi F, Tanha A, Meshkat M. Bayesian critical values for
656 Lawshe's content validity ratio. Meas Eval Couns Dev [Internet]. 2019 [cited
657 2022 Nov 15];52(1):69-73. DOI 10.1080/07481756.2017.1308227. Available at:
658 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07481756.2017.1308227>
- 659 25. Ayre C, Scally AJ. Critical values for lawshe's content validity ratio: revisiting
660 the original methods of calculation. Meas Eval Couns Dev [Internet]. 2014

- 661 [cited 2022 Nov 15];47(1):79-86. DOI 10.1177/0748175613513808. Available
662 at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0748175613513808>
- 663 26. Ortiz La Banca R, Rebustini F, Alvarenga WA, Carvalho EC, Lopes M,
664 Milaszewski K, et al. Checklists for Assessing Skills of Children With Type 1
665 Diabetes on Insulin Injection Technique. J Diabetes Sci Technol [Internet]. 2022
666 [cited 2022 Dec 21];16(3):742–750. DOI 10.1177/1932296820984771.
667 Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9294572/>
- 668 27. Palacio DC, Rebustini F, Oliveira DB, Peres Neto J, Barbieri W, Sanchez TP.
669 Dental vulnerability scale in primary health care: evidence of content and
670 structure internal validity. BMC Oral Health [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022 Dec
671 21];21(1) DOI 10.1186/s12903-021-01742-6. Available from:
672 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34454449/>
- 673 28. DeVellis RF. Scale development: theory and applications. 4th ed. Thousand
674 Oaks: Sage; 2017. 261 p.
- 675 29. PlanificaSUS. e-Planifica [Internet]. São Paulo: PlanificaSUS; 2022 [cited 2022
676 Nov 15]. Available at: <https://planificasus.com.br/>
- 677 30. Lorenzo-Seva U, Ferrando PJ. MSA: The Forgotten Index for Identifying
678 Inappropriate Items Before Computing Exploratory Item Factor Analysis.
679 Methodology [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022 Nov 15];17(4):296-306. DOI
680 <https://doi.org/10.5964/meth.7185>. Available at:
681 <https://meth.psychopen.eu/index.php/meth/article/view/7185>
- 682 31. Lorenzo-Seva U, Van Ginkel JR. Multiple Imputation of missing values in
683 exploratory factor analysis of multidimensional scales: estimating latent trait
684 scores. Anal. Psicol [Internet]. 2016 [cited 2022 Nov 15];32(2):596-608. DOI
685 <https://dx.doi.org/10.6018/analesps.32.2.215161>. Available at:

- 686 <https://scielo.isciii.es/scielo.php?pid=S0212->
687 [97282016000200034&script=sci_abstract&tlng=en](https://scielo.isciii.es/scielo.php?pid=S0212-97282016000200034&script=sci_abstract&tlng=en)
- 688 32. Timmerman ME, Lorenzo-Seva U. Dimensionality assessment of ordered
689 polytomous items with parallel analysis. Psychol Methods [Internet]. 2011 [cited
690 2022 Nov 15];16(2):209-220. DOI 10.1037/a0023353. Available at:
691 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21500916/>
- 692 33. Lim S, Jahng S. Determining the number of factors using parallel analysis and
693 its recent variants. Psychol Methods [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2022 Nov
694 15];24(4):452. DOI 10.1037/met0000230. Available at:
695 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31180694/>
- 696 34. Auerswald M, Moshagen M. How to determine the number of factors to retain in
697 exploratory factor analysis: A comparison of extraction methods under realistic
698 conditions. Psychol Methods [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2022 Nov 15];24(4):468–
699 491. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000200>. Available at:
700 <https://psycnet.apa.org/doiLanding?doi=10.1037%2Fmet0000200>
- 701 35. Dobriban E, Owen AB. Deterministic parallel analysis: an improved method for
702 selecting factors and principal components. J R Stat Soc Series B Stat Methodol
703 [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2022 Nov 15];81(1):163-183. DOI
704 <https://doi.org/10.1111/rssb.12301>. Available at:
705 <https://rss.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/rssb.12301>
- 706 36. Cho SJ, Li F, Bandalos D. Accuracy of the parallel analysis procedure with
707 polychoric correlations. Educ Psychol Meas [Internet]. 2009 [cited 2022 Nov
708 15];69(5):748-759. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164409332229>. Available
709 at: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0013164409332229>

- 710 37. Briggs NE, MacCallum RC. Recovery of Weak Common Factors by Maximum
711 Likelihood and Ordinary Least Squares Estimation. *Multivariate Behav Res*
712 [Internet]. 2003 [cited 2022 Nov 15];38(1):25-56. DOI
713 10.1207/S15327906MBR3801_2. Available at:
714 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26771123/>
- 715 38. Choi J, Kim S, Chen J, Dannels S. A Comparison of Maximum Likelihood and
716 Bayesian Estimation for Polychoric Correlation Using Monte Carlo Simulation.
717 *J Educ Behav Stat* [Internet]. 2011 [cited 2022 Nov 15];36(4):523–549. DOI
718 <https://doi.org/10.3102/1076998610381398>. Available at:
719 <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.3102/1076998610381398>
- 720 39. Jöreskog KG, Sörbom D. LISREL V: analysis of linear structural
721 relationships by maximum likelihood and least squares methods. 5th ed.
722 Uppsala, Sweden: University of Uppsala; 1981.
- 723 40. Holgado-Tello FP, Chacón-Moscoso S, Barbero-García I, Vila-Abad E.
724 Polychoric versus Pearson correlations in exploratory and confirmatory factor
725 analysis of ordinal variables. *Qual Quant* [Internet]. 2010 [cited 2022 Nov
726 15];44(1):153–166. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-008-9190-y>. Available
727 at: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11135-008-9190-y>
- 728 41. Baglin J. Improving your exploratory factor analysis for ordinal data: A
729 demonstration using FACTOR. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*
730 [Internet]. 2014 [cited 2022 Nov 15];19(5) DOI [https://doi.org/10.7275/dsep-](https://doi.org/10.7275/dsep-4220)
731 [4220](https://doi.org/10.7275/dsep-4220). Available at: <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/pare/vol19/iss1/5/>
- 732 42. Osborne JW, Banjanovic ES. *Exploratory factor analysis with SAS*. North
733 Carolina: SAS Institute Inc.; 2016.

- 734 43. Lorenzo-Seva U. Promin: a method for oblique factor rotation. *Multivariate*
735 *Behav Res* [Internet]. 1999 [cited 2022 Nov 15];34(3):347-365. DOI
736 10.1207/s15327906mbr3403_3. Available at:
737 https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1207/S15327906MBR3403_3
- 738 44. Ferrando PJ, Lorenzo-Seva U. Assessing the quality and appropriateness of
739 factor solutions and factor score estimates in exploratory item factor analysis.
740 *Educ Psychol Meas* [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2022 Nov 15];78(5):762-780. DOI
741 10.1177/0013164417719308. Available at:
742 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32655169/>
- 743 45. Hair JF, Babin BJ, Anderson RE, Black WC. *Multivariate Data Analysis*. 8th ed.
744 [place unknown]: CENGAGE INDIA; 2018. 832 p.
- 745 46. Costello AB, Osborne J. Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four
746 recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment,*
747 *Research & Evaluation* [Internet]. 2005 [cited 2022 Nov 15];10(1):7. DOI
748 <https://doi.org/10.7275/jyj1-4868>. Available at:
749 <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1156&context=pars>
- 750 47. Wu AD, Zumbo BD, Marshall SK. A method to aid in the interpretation of EFA
751 results: An application of Pratt's measures. *Int J Behav Dev* [Internet]. 2014
752 [cited 2022 Nov 15];38(1):98-110. DOI
753 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025413506143>. Available at:
754 <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0165025413506143>
- 755 48. Wu AD, Zumbo BD. Using Pratt's Importance Measures in Confirmatory Factor
756 Analyses. *J Mod Appl Stat Methods* [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2022 Nov
757 15];16(2):81-98. DOI 10.22237/jmasm/1509494700. Available at:
758 <https://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/jmasm/vol16/iss2/5/>

- 759 49. Crobach LJ. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*
760 [Internet]. 1951 [cited 2022 Nov 15];16(3):297–334. DOI
761 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02310555>. Available at:
762 <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF02310555>
- 763 50. Woodhouse B, Jackson PH. Lower bounds for the reliability of the total score on
764 a test composed of non-homogeneous items: II: A search procedure to locate the
765 greatest lower bound. *Psychometrika* [Internet]. 1977 [cited 2022 Nov
766 15];42(4):579–591. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02295980>. Available at:
767 <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF02295980>
- 768 51. McDonald RP. *Test theory: A unified treatment*. 1st ed. [place unknown]:
769 Psychology Press; 2013.
- 770 52. Ferrando PJ, Lorenzo-Seva U. A note on improving EAP trait estimation in
771 oblique factor-analytic and item response theory models. *Psicologica* [Internet].
772 2016 [cited 2022 Nov 15];37:235-247. Available at:
773 <https://www.uv.es/revispsi/articulos2.16/7Ferrando.pdf>
- 774 53. Gütlein M, Helma C, Karwath A, Kramer S. A Large-Scale Empirical
775 Evaluation of Cross-Validation and External Test Set Validation in (Q)SAR.
776 *Mol Inform* [Internet]. 2013 [cited 2022 Nov 15];32(5-6):516-528. DOI
777 10.1002/minf.201200134. Available at:
778 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27481669/>
- 779 54. Lorenzo-Seva U. SOLOMON: a method for splitting a sample into equivalent
780 subsamples in factor analysis. *Behav Res Methods* [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022
781 Nov 15];:1-13. DOI <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-021-01750-y>. Available at:
782 <https://link.springer.com/article/10.3758/s13428-021-01750-y>

- 783 55. Brown TA. Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research. 2nd ed. [place
784 unknown]: Guilford publications; 2015. 462 p. ISBN: 9781462515363.
- 785 56. Mialhe FL, Sampaio HAC, Moraes KL, Brasil VV, Rebutini F. Psychometric
786 properties of the Brazilian version of the European Health Literacy Survey
787 Questionnaire short form. Health Promot Int [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2022 Nov
788 15];37(4):daac130. DOI 10.1093/heapro/daac130. Available at:
789 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36102478/>
- 790 57. Mialhe FL, Moraes KL, Bado FMR, Brasil VV, Sampaio HAC, Rebutini F.
791 Psychometric properties of the adapted instrument European Health Literacy
792 Survey Questionnaire short-short form. Rev Lat Am Enfermagem [Internet].
793 2021 [cited 2022 Nov 15];29:e3436. DOI 10.1590/1518-8345.4362.3436.
794 Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34231791/>
- 795 58. Koul A, Becchio C, Cavallo A. Cross-validation approaches for replicability in
796 psychology. Front Psychol [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2022 Nov 15];9:1117. DOI
797 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01117. Available at:
798 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30034353/>
- 799 59. Hair JR, Black WC, Babin BJ, Anderson R, Tatham RL. Multivariate Data
800 Analysis. 7th ed. Upper Saddle River: Pearson Prentice Hall; 2019.
- 801 60. Boedeker P, Kearns NT. Linear Discriminant Analysis for Prediction of Group
802 Membership: A User-Friendly Primer. Adv Methods Pract Psychol Sci
803 [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2022 Dec 21];2(3):250-263. DOI
804 10.1177/2515245919849378. Available from:
805 <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/2515245919849378>
- 806 61. Tabachnick BG, Fidell LS. Using multivariate statistics. Boston: Pearson; 2019.

- 807 62. Marmot M. Social justice, epidemiology and health inequalities. Eur J
808 Epidemiol [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2022 Nov 22];32(7):537–546. DOI
809 10.1007/s10654-017-0286-3. Available at:
810 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5570780/#CR28>
- 811 63. Marmot M. Social determinants of health inequalities. The Lancet [Internet].
812 2005 [cited 2022 Nov 22];365(9464):1099-1104. DOI
813 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(05\)71146-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(05)71146-6). Available at:
814 [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736\(05\)71146-](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(05)71146-6/fulltext)
815 [6/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(05)71146-6/fulltext)
- 816 64. Dahlgren G, Whitehead M, compilers. Policies and strategies to promote social
817 equity in health [bibliography on the Internet]. [place unknown: publisher
818 unknown]; 1991 [cited 2022 Nov 22]. Available at:
819 <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/6472456.pdf>
- 820 65. Preda A, Voigt K. The Social Determinants of Health: Why Should We Care?.
821 Am J Bioeth [Internet]. 2015 [cited 2022 Nov 22];15(3):25-36. DOI
822 10.1080/15265161.2014.998374. Available at:
823 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25786009/>
- 824 66. Barata RB, Almeida MF, Montero CV, Silva ZP. Health inequalities based on
825 ethnicity in individuals aged 15 to 64, Brazil, 1998. Cad Saude Publica
826 [Internet]. 2007 [cited 2022 Dec 21];23(2):305-313. Available from:
827 <https://www.scielosp.org/article/csp/2007.v23n2/305-313/#ModalArticles>
- 828 67. Mechanic D, Tanner J. Vulnerable people, groups, and populations: societal
829 view. Health Aff (Millwood) [Internet]. 2007 [cited 2022 Nov 22];26(5):1220-
830 1230. DOI 10.1377/hlthaff.26.5.1220. Available at:
831 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17848429/>

- 832 68. Mao M, Zang L, Zhang H. The Effects of Parental Absence on Children
833 Development: Evidence from Left-Behind Children in China. *Int J Environ Res*
834 *Public Health* [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2022 Nov 24];17(18):6770. DOI doi:
835 10.3390/ijerph17186770. Available at:
836 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32957472/>
- 837 69. Chen L, Wulczyn F, Huhr S. Parental absence, early reading, and human capital
838 formation for rural children in China. *J Community Psychol* [Internet]. 2022
839 [cited 2022 Nov 24];:1-14. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.22786>. Available
840 at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/jcop.22786>
- 841 70. Fu M, Xue Y, Zhou W, Yuan T. Parental absence predicts suicide ideation
842 through emotional disorders. *PLOS ONE* [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2022 Nov
843 24];12(12):e0188823. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0188823>.
844 Available at:
845 <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0188823>
- 846 71. Inoue Y, Fukunaga A, Stickley A, Yzawa A, Pham TTP, Nguyen CQ, et al.
847 Association between parental absence during childhood and depressive
848 symptoms in adulthood in rural Vietnam. *J Affect Disord* [Internet]. 2022 [cited
849 2022 Nov 24];311:479-485. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2022.05.102>.
850 Available at:
851 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S016503272200622X>
- 852 72. Lacey RE, Zilanawala A, Webb E, Abell J, Bell S. Parental absence in early
853 childhood and onset of smoking and alcohol consumption before adolescence.
854 *Arch Dis Child* [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2022 Nov 24];103(7):691-694. DOI
855 10.1136/archdischild-2016-310444. Available at:
856 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27831906/>

- 857 73. Lee BX, Donnelly PD, Cohen L, Garg S. Violence, health, and the 2030 agenda:
858 Merging evidence and implementation. *J Public Health Policy* [Internet]. 2016
859 [cited 2022 Nov 24];37(1):1-12. DOI 10.1057/s41271-016-0011-6. Available at:
860 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27638239/>
- 861 74. Huang X, King C, McAtee J. Exposure to violence, neighborhood context, and
862 health-related outcomes in low-income urban mothers. *Health & Place*
863 [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2022 Nov 24];54:138-148. DOI
864 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2018.09.008>. Available at:
865 [https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1353829217307165?via%3D](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1353829217307165?via%3Dihub)
866 [ihub](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1353829217307165?via%3Dihub)
- 867 75. Oliveira MAC, Pereira IC. Atributos essenciais da Atenção Primária e a
868 Estratégia Saúde da Família. *Rev Bras Enferm* [Internet]. 2013 [cited 2022 Nov
869 24];66 DOI <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0034-71672013000700020>. Available at:
870 <https://www.scielo.br/j/reben/a/5XkBZTcLysW8fTmnXFMjC6z/?lang=pt>
- 871 76. Streiner DL, Norman GR, Cairney J. *Health Measurement Scales: A practical*
872 *guide to their development and use* [Internet]. 5th ed. Oxford: Oxford University
873 Press; 2014 [cited 2022 Dec 21]. ISBN: 9780191765452. DOI
874 <https://doi.org/10.1093/med/9780199685219.001.0001>. Available from:
875 <https://academic.oup.com/book/24920>
- 876 77. Pedrosa I, Suárez-Álvarez J, García-Cueto E. Content Validity Evidences:
877 Theoretical Advances and Estimation Methods. *Acción Psicológica* [Internet].
878 2014 [cited 2022 Dec 21];10(2):3-18. DOI
879 <https://doi.org/10.5944/ap.10.2.11820>. Available from:
880 <https://revistas.uned.es/index.php/accionpsicologica/article/view/11820>

- 881 78. Gjersing L, Caplehorn JRM, Clausen T. Cross-cultural adaptation of research
882 instruments: language, setting, time and statistical considerations. BMC Med
883 Res Methodol [Internet]. 2010 [cited 2022 Dec 21];10:10-13. DOI
884 10.1186/1471-2288-10-13. Available from:
885 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20144247/>
- 886 79. Wilson FR, Pan W, Schumsky DA. Recalculation of the Critical Values for
887 Lawshe's Content Validity Ratio. Meas Eval Couns Dev [Internet]. 2012 [cited
888 2022 Dec 21];45(3):197-210. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1177/0748175612440286>.
889 Available from:
890 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1177/0748175612440286>