Innovative Journal of Pediatrics
Volume 34 · Issue 5 · e145341

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Validity and Reliability of the Persian Translation of the World Health Organization (WHO) Oral Health Self-assessment Questionnaire for Children and Adolescents

Farnaz Jafari, Amir Nekouei, Homa Kamyabi, Shahla Kakoei

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
23 Jan 2024	16 Jun 2024	20 Jun 2024	10.5812/ijp-145341

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Narges Farhad-Mollashahi 2
2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 7

1 Original submission

2 comments · 25 Feb 2024 – 31 Mar 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 25 Feb 2024

The following points could be considered:
Method:
Line 93: Change 12-18 to 13-18.
Line 96: Please explain the randomization method.
Line 111: Back translation means translation from Persian to English and needs to be corrected.
Line 118: Add content validity to this section.
Line 122, 211: The methods of evaluating validity (content validity and construct validity) are missing. Though the abstract states that 20 subjects were evaluated for validity, a thorough explanation is needed in the method section. If factor analysis was also used for validity, more details about this are recommended.
Results:
1. Table 1, add "very" before poor in the first line.
2. Line 200 and tables 5 and 6: Provide more explanation of factor loadings, such as the aim of using them, the cutoff, and negative values.
3. Line 225: Please add the cutoff for alpha-Cronbach.
4. Line 267: It is better to explain exploratory factor analysis first in the results, then in more detail in the discussion.

Narges Farhad-Mollashahi Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 31 Mar 2024

• Subject
The article has novelty. The title reflects the content appropriately.
• Abstract
There is a structured abstract.
• Introduction
The objectives are clearly stated.
• Materials And Methods
Explain the blinding of investigators. Add inclusion/exclusion criteria.
• References
The order of the references is not correct. The discussion should start with reference 18 if it started with 21. Add a newer reference from 2020.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Reply to Reviewers

Comments from Reviewer 1:

Methods:

- *Comment 1: Line 93: Change 12-18 to 13-18*
  Response: Thank you for pointing this out. We have changed it.

- *Comment 2: Line 96: Please explain the randomization method.*
  Response: Thank you for your suggestion. We have added an explanation as follows:
  We gathered the schools in Kerman City, ranging from elementary to high school, and then chose 30 of them with simple random sampling.

- *Comment 3: Line 111: Back translation means translation from Persian to English, and needs to be corrected.*
  Response: We thank the reviewer for pointing this out. We have revised.

- *Comment 4: Line 118: Add content validity to this section.*
  Response: Thank you for pointing this out. We have added an explanation about content validity as follows: As this questionnaire has been developed and thoroughly reviewed by professionals within WHO which ensures its content, we have strictly focused on providing an accurate translation without making any modifications or alterations to its content.

- *Comment 5: Line 122, 211: The methods of evaluating validity (content validity and construct validity) are missing. Though in the abstract it is pointed out that 20 subjects were evaluated for validity, a thorough explanation is needed in the method section. If the factor analysis was also used for validity. Providing more details for this part is advocated.*
  Response: Thank you for this excellent suggestion. We have added explanations for content and construct validity and explanatory factor analysis in the method section as follows:
  Content validity: As this questionnaire has been developed and thoroughly reviewed by professionals within WHO which ensures its content, we have strictly focused on providing an accurate translation without making any modifications or alterations to its content. The pilot phase was conducted to assess the clarity and fluency of the Persian translation of the questionnaire, without any evaluation of its validity. This mistake was corrected in all parts (abstract, method, result, discussion) and we have replaced it with clarity and fluency.

Construct validity: The questionnaire had two main areas as oral health, and habits (habits related to health behaviors, nutrition behaviors, and behaviors related to tobacco and alcohol). Explanatory factor analysis was employed to evaluate the construct validity by assessing these areas across distinct components.

Factor analysis: In explanatory factor analysis, the factor loadings indicate that how the items of the questionnaire influence a component. The factor loadings range from -1 to 1, with values of -1 and 1 representing strong positive and negative influences. A factor loading of 0.35 is regarded as significant(25).

Thank you for this suggestion. It would have been interesting to explore this aspect. However, In the factor analysis, similar to previous studies, we did not extract two separate factors from the questions. Therefore, we did not provide further explanations, such as detailed factor loadings and coefficients, in the methods section. However, we have added more explanations of the factor analysis approach in the methods and result section at your request.

Results:

- *Comment6: Table 1, add "very" before poor at first line*
  Response: As suggested by the reviewer, we have corrected it.

- *Comment 7: Line 200 and tables 5 and 6: Provide more explanation for factor loadings such as the aim of using, cutoff, and negative values.*
  Response: Thank you for your suggestion, we have added the following explanation in the result : The majority of item factor loadings in the first two components exceeded 0.35 for both children under 12 years old and those over 12 years old. A different factor loading sign was observed for the items with a negative correlation.

- *Comment 8: Line 225: Please add the cutoff for alpha-Cronbach.*
  Response: Thank you for pointing this out. We have provided an explanation in the method-statistical analysis section with reference as follows: Cronbach's alpha acceptable range of values was 0.6 to 0.95(24).

- *Comment 9: Line 267: Exploratory factor analysis is better to explain in results first, then with more details in the discussion.*

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. It would have been interesting to explore this aspect. However, In the factor analysis, similar to previous studies, we did not extract two separate factors from the questions. Therefore, we did not provide further explanations, such as detailed factor loadings and coefficients, in the methods section. However, we have added brief explanations of the factor analysis approach in the methods and result section at your request.

***Comments from Reviewer 2**:*

Subject

- *Comment 1: the article has novelty. the title reflects the content appropriately.*
  Response: Thank you.

Abstract

- *Comment 2: there is a structured Abstract.*
  Response: Thank you for your feedback.

Introduction

- *Comment 3: the objectives are clearly stated.*
  Response: Thank you.

Materials And Methods

- *Comment 4: explain about Blinding of Investigators. add Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria.*
  Response: Thank you for pointing this out. Given the observational nature of our cross-sectional study, we did not incorporate a blinding investigation as it is more valuable for clinical trials.
  Thank you for your suggestion. We have provided an explanation for Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria as follows:

Exclusion /Inclusion criteria: All students between 7 and 18 years old who attended the selected schools were examined. Individuals who were absent from the class or those who did not agree to participate were excluded.

References

Comment 5: The order of the references is not correct. The beginning of the discussion should start with reference 18, if it started with 21. Add a newer reference from 2020
Response: Thank you for pointing this out. We have corrected and updated the reference part.
Response: Thank you for pointing this out. *We have corrected the order of references and updated the reference part with 6 new references. References 2,6,7,20,21,22 have been added.*

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 18 Jun 2024

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 18 Jun 2024

Hi dear editor in chief
The manuscript is now appropriate for publication in the journal.