OPEN PEER REVIEW

Open Peer Review (OPR)

As a new feature for progressing towards transparency, we decided to open a new window for all of our editors as well as authors titled "**Open Peer Review**". We hope by this new facility, our reviewers will be more motivated and authors will be more satisfied with the review process. We believe that publishing our peer review reports could make a transparent and clear environment for all our efforts within a journal, but not all reviewers tend to publish their comments.

What is "Open Peer Review" process?

An "Open Peer Review" process is making the details of all review process (including reviewers, associate editors, and EICs comments) as "Public" as it is agreed by EIC, Authors, and reviewers.

Advantages of "Open Peer Review" process

- More transparency, constructiveness and tactful comments of the peer review process: leads to an increase in the quality of reviews
- More motivations for all involved roles in the review process
- Authors' satisfactions from the review process: Increases honesty between authors and reviewers
- Education of both authors and new students
- Prevents reviewers from following their individual agendas and leading to the detection of reviewers' conflicts of interests

You can find out more at:
https://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Archives of Pediatric Infectious Diseases
Article DOI: 10.5812/pedinfect.112368
Published in: Archives of Pediatric Infectious Diseases: In Press(In Press); e112368

Peer Review Report for "Children's Perception Scale of Head Lice Infestation (CPS-HLI): Design and Psychometrics"

Author(s): Gona Bekry, Parvin Sarbakhsh, Hamid Allahverdipour, Abdolreza Shaghaghi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 22 Dec 2020
Revised Date: 26 Mar 2021
Accepted Date: 19 Apr 2021

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 29 Dec 2020

Dear EIC,
In a psychometric study, the purpose of creating a tool is to measure concepts that are important to the researcher for a number of reasons. In this study, the concepts the authors are interested in are concepts related to children's understanding of Pediculosis. In the following, the items related to the concepts are extracted based on the search for scientific literature; so it is necessary to explain the concepts related to Pediculosis first, then the types of measurements. And then they refer to the measurement of the reliability and validity of the items.
Please the authors revise the manuscript accordingly.
Regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 6 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
Thanks for this manuscript. I have some comments for the authors:
Methods and Materials:
- Sample size calculation was not written.
Results:

- Is too long and incomprehensive. The explanations should be transferred to method section. Your final results has not been elucidated briefly in any items.

Discussion:

- In the first part of your discussion you have to write your main results briefly.
- You didn't compare your results with other studies.
- You didn't mention the similarities and differences of your results with other studies and didn't write the probable causes.
- Limitations of your study were not written.

Conclusion:

- At the end of your conclusion you have to recommend further needed studies about some of your results.

Footnotes:

- Acknowledgement was not mentioned.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 22 Feb 2021

Dear EIC,

This manuscript was reviewed by reviewers, some of them raised significant objections to the manuscript (especially in the method part). Therefore, the authors should follow the reviewer's comments exactly and respond to their comments point-by-point. All changes should be highlighted in different colors before the next submission. Also, the English language should be improved.

Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 22 Feb 2021

Dear Authors,

My decision about this manuscript is major revision.

Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Dear editor of the Archives of Pediatric Infectious Diseases

As the corresponding author of the submitted manuscript entitled "***The Children's Perception Scale of Head Lice Infestation (CPS-HLI): design and psychometric***" I would like to appreciate the respected reviewers' comments and their time and energy for further improvement of this paper's quality.

Please find below the authors point-by-point answers to the provided comments and do not hesitate to contact for any further clarification. I hope this draft could meet the journal standards for possible publication.

Reply to Reviewers' Comments

Reviewer 1:

A. Methods and Materials: Sample size calculation was not written.

RESPONSE TO COM A: The sample size calculation was added (first paragraph of the "Materials and Methods" section) as highlighted in the text.

B. Results: Is too long and incomprehensive. The explanations should be transferred to method section. Your final results has not been elucidated briefly in any items.

RESPONSE TO COM B:

The results section was revised i.e. it was summarized and additional explanations were transferred to the methods section. The final results were also summarized and included in this section. Detailed information about the results were provided in the tables.

C. Discussion:

- ***At first part of your discussion you have to write your main results briefly.***
- ***You didn't compare your results with other studies.***

-You didn't mention the similarities and differences of your results with other studies and didn't write the probable causes.

-Limitations of your study were not written.

RESPONSE TO COM C:

- Main findings of the study were highlighted in the first paragraph of the discussion section as recommended.
- The study results were compared explicitly with other studies in national and international levels as recommended.
- Due to inherent nature of the study and designing of a measurement tool for first time to assess children's perception about HLI, this study findings were not comparable with outputs of any other study.
- The study limitations were mentioned separately under the subtitle of "Limitations" at the end of the "Discussion" section as suggested.

D. Conclusion: At the end of your conclusion you have to recommend further needed studies about some of your results.

RESPONSE TO COM D:

- Further need to research and extensive testing of the CPS-HLI with different populations and diverse socio-economic background of school-age children was mentioned at the end of "Conclusion" section as recommended.

E. Footnotes: **Acknowledgments were mentioned**

RESPONSE TO COM E: "Acknowledgements" was added to the end of "Footnotes" section as recommended.

Associate Editor's Comments

Associate Editor 1: In a psychometric study, the purpose of creating a tool is to measure concepts that are important to the researcher for a number of reasons. In this study, the concepts you are interested in are concepts related to children's understanding of Pediculosis. In the following, the items related to the concepts are extracted based on the search for scientific literature; so it is necessary to explain the concepts related to Pediculosis first, then the types of measurements. And then refer to the measurement of the reliability and validity of the items. Please revise the manuscript accordingly.

RESPONSE TO COM Associate Editor 1:

The “Background & Objectives” of the manuscript was revised as recommended and authors tried to further harmonize texts and restructure the explanations provided as highlighted with different color in the section.

Associate Editor 2: Your manuscript reviewed by reviewers, some of them raised significant objections to the manuscript (especially in the method part). Therefore, please follow the reviewer's comments exactly and response to their comments point-by-point. All changes should be highlighted with different colours before the next submission. Also, the English language should be improved.

RESPONSE TO COM Associate Editor 2:

The authors did all their best to comply with the respected reviewers’ comments and provide point-by-point responses to the raised issues. The whole manuscript was also checked for typos and errors by a professional proof reader and hope all the amendments could meet the journal standards.

Best wishes

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 17 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
Thank you for the revisions.
Thanks.

Ali Amanati: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 19 Apr 2021

Dear EIC,
I read the revised manuscript, I have no further comments to add. I thank the authors for their very detailed replies to the comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 19 Apr 2021

Dear Authors,
My decision about this manuscript is accepting.
Thanks.