IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Volume 15 · Issue 4 · e112573

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Psychometric Evaluation of the Child Sensory Profile 2 (CSP2) Among Children with Dyslexia

Mahnaz Estaki, Ameneh Dehghan, Ebrahim Mahmoudi Kojidi, Navid Mirzakhani Araghi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
15 Jan 2021	10 Jul 2021	15 Sep 2021	10.5812/ijpbs.112573

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** Minoo Dabiri Golchin, Soheila Shahshahani, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Referee 2, Editor-in-Chief 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 8
3 **Revision 2** Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 9
Authors' reply to reviewers 10
Reviewer and editor comments 12

1 Original submission

3 comments · 27 Jan 2021 – 22 Mar 2021

Minoo Dabiri Golchin Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 27 Jan 2021

Dear Author

Thank you for your inquiry into this journal. I read your work and have some suggestions for you:
1- Please write your keywords in alphabetical order.
2- Your paper does not have a good start. You have written that children learn through interactions with the environment and then: games are so common in the current time. Then: sensory processing is important for academic skills. Not only is the connection poor, but the statements are also somewhat unrelated. Your study is not about gaming. Are you claiming that games may lead to dyslexia? Are games the reason for poor sensory processing? Please correct and clarify this.
3- Then at the end of your introduction you have written that dyslexia can lead to poor executive function. And then you have left this information behind. Is executive function related to your work? If you want to write about the effects of dyslexia on a child's life, the place is not at the end of the introduction section.
4- You have written that this test has been studied in different groups. Please specify which groups and provide references.
5- You have written that your participants were 6 to 14 years old. In the abstract, you have written 3 to 14.
6- Did you not have a formal diagnosis of LD? You cannot count on a teacher's diagnosis.
7- Please describe which kinds of psychometric issues have been studied before in Iran. It seems that you are redoing some of them. Please describe why. Can the population change the construct validity or internal consistency? Please clarify these parts.

Sincerely

Soheila Shahshahani Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 13 Feb 2021

Dear Mr. Yazdan rajeh Naderi
Thank you for inviting me to review the article "Psychometric evaluation of the Child Sensory Profile 2 (CSP2) among Children with Dyslexia". I have the following comments for the authors.
Abstract
In the results part, please write the name of the measure: "α Cronbach".
What is the extended form of NEMA? In general, the results part is not clear and needs more description.
In the background, you wrote, "The results of studies indicate that a disorder of rapid neural adaptation is the cause of dyslexia" but referred to only one study.
In a subsequent paragraph, the first sentence is unfinished.
In the Sampling and Participants section, please review the inclusion criteria. Are the caregivers your participants or the children?
In the instrument section, you wrote: 1-"psychometric properties of the Persian version of this test in Iran have been studied by Shahbazi et al ". Please describe what the result of this study was.
2- Dyslexia test (NEMA), "This test has been standardized by Karami and Nouri in 2014". Did they create the test?
In the Statistical Analysis section, please write the complete words: Kuder Richardson.
In the first paragraph of the results, you wrote, "Table 1 displays the demographic characteristics of the participants. In total, 200 patients." Please change it to parents or caregivers of children.

The discussion part is weak.
Although the relationship between the quadrants of the CSP2 questionnaire and children's dyslexia was meaningful, it is not very strong. Please describe the relationship according to your finding.

Editor-in-Chief MAJOR REVISION 22 Mar 2021

Your paper has been evaluated by external peer reviewers. Please make your revisions according to the reviewers' comments.

After revising the manuscript, authors are obliged to upload a Word file containing the reviewers' comments and their replies to each comment.

Besides, please pay attention to the word count limitation:
Word count limits are declared in this link: http://kowsarpub.com/en/index.php/services/for-authors/895-word-count

We look forward to receiving your revised manuscript. Thank you for sending your work to the Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences.

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.

Dear Reviewers

Thank you for your attention.

I resubmitted the article according to your comments.

Best Regards

Reviewer 1:

1- Please write your keywords in an alphabetic turn:

A: It is changed to: Child Sensory Profile 2 (CSP2), Dyslexia, Psychometric properties

2- Your paper does not have a good start. You have written that children learn throughout interactions from the environment and then: games are so common in the current time. Then: sensory processing is important for academic skills. Not only it is a poor connection, but also somehow unrelated. Your study is not about gaming. Are you claiming that games may lead to dyslexia? Are games the reason for poor sensory processing? Please correct and clarify this

A. It has been changed to: The advancement of technology would deprive children from using their senses. This would lead to sensory problems in children.

3- Then at the end of your introduction you have written that dyslexia can lead to poor executive function. And then you have left this information behind. Is executive function related to your work? If you want to write about the effects of dyslexia on a child's life, the place is not at the end of the introduction section.

A. At the end of this paragraph, it has been written that sensory problems in children lead to poor executive functions not dyslexia.

4- You have written that this test has been studied in different groups. Please write which groups and provide references.

A:This test has been studied in Autism spectrum disorder, learning disability and typical individuals.

5- You have written that your participants were 6 to 14 years old. In the abstract, you have written 3 to 14. It is 6 to 12, which has been corrected.

6- Did not you have a formal diagnosis for LD? You cannot count on a teacher's diagnosis.

A: In is changed to ; On behalf of the school teacher, the children are suspected of learning disabilities and have referred to learning disability centers and have diagnosed as a dyslexic child.

7- Please describe that which kinds of psychometric issues have studied before in Iran? It seems that you are re-doing some of them. Please describe why. Can

the population change the construct validity or internal consistency? Please clarify these parts.

Reviewer 2:

1- Replaced four quadrants with four subscales : A:It is changed.

2- In abstract missed conclusion: It is added to the abstract.

3- In abstract time of study: It is written and highlighted.

4-

5- Summarize the tools section and report just important things. And report the psychometric properties of the Persian version of this questionnaire.

A: Some parts of this section have been deleted ,and the psychometric properties of the CSP2 have been added at the end of the paragraph of the explanation of this test.

6- In analysis section just write important things, and delete redundancies.

A:The redundancies have been deleted.

7- In Table 2. Values of Internal Consistency Coefficient Alphas for CSP2 in Dyslexia Children….please specify which kind of Internal Consistency : Cronbach alpha which is written in the first sentence of the results section.

8- In Construct validity: convergent : As can be seen in the table, the sensory avoiding quadrant has a high inverse and meaningful relationship with NEMA (r = 0.678)… please modify in this way (-0.678) :

A:It has been changed.

9- In Discussion : replaced in Qom with in Iran : A:It has been replaced.

10- Discussion shouldn't have any headline. A:The headlines have been deleted.

11- Relate the explanations provided to the points you mentioned in the introduction.

A: Some sentences are added in the discussion, which is about the relationship between sensory processing and NEMA.

12- Compare your new findings with the findings of others previous studies. This is the first study which is done about this subject.

13- Do not repeat the results with different words in this section.

14- Mention possible explanations for consistency and inconsistency results of your studies with others previous studies.

Reviewer 3:

Thank you for inviting me to review the article “Psychometric evaluation of the Child Sensory Profile 2 (CSP2) among Children with Dyslexia”. I have following comments for the authors.

Abstract

In the results part, please write the name of measure: “α Cronbach”. : A:It has been done.

What is the extended form of NEMA? In general, the result part is not clear and needs more description.

A:The NEMA does not have the extended form and it has known as the dyslexic test or NEMA, because the creators of this test are Iranian and they did not mention the extended form of it in any articles.

In the background, you wrote, “The results of studies indicate that a disorder of rapid neural adaptation is the cause of dyslexia” but referred to one research.:

A:It is changed to the results of a study.

In the further paragraph, the first sentence is unfinished.:

A:It has been corrected.

In the Sampling and Participants, please review the inclusion criteria. Are the caregivers your participants or the children?

A:Respondents of the tests are their caregivers.

In the instrument, you wrote, 1-“psychometric properties of the Persian version of this test in Iran have been studied by Shahbazi et al “please describe that what the result of this study was?

A:The psychometric properties of the CSP2 have been added at the end of the paragraph of the explanation of this test.

Dyslexia test (NEMA), “This test has been standardized by Karami and Nouri in 2014”. Do they create the test?

A:They created and standardized it.

In the Statistical Analysis, please write the complete words: kuder Richardson:
A:It is done.

In the first paragraph of results you wrote, “Table 1 displays the demographic characteristics of the participants. In total, 200 patients. Please change it to Parents or caregivers of children. A:It has been changed.

The discussion part is weak. Some sentences are added to the discussion part, which have been highlighted.

Although the relationship between the quadrants of CSP2 questionnaire and children's dyslexia was meaningful but it is not very strong. Please describe the relationship according to your finding. Some sentences are added to the discussion part, which have been highlighted.

2 Revision 1

3 comments · 8 May 2021 – 2 Jul 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 8 May 2021

- Replace quadrants with subscales in the Abstract, Results and Discussion sections.
- Exclusion criteria?
- The discussion section is completely repetitive. You have repeated the results and subscales of the questionnaire in this section. Please rewrite it.

Referee 2 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 6 Jun 2021

1- Data analysis should be integrated and summarized, not presented under separate headings: Internal consistency; Construct validity: convergent; Confirmatory factor analysis.
2- Study Design and Sampling and Participants should be integrated.
3- In the Discussion, paragraph 1 should be integrated with another paragraph; there should not be a 2-line paragraph.
4- "This is the first study which is done about this subject" is not an acceptable reply … We mean other studies that use other research conducted on different samples/populations/patients. So…
5- Mention possible explanations for the consistency and inconsistency of the results of your studies with those of previous studies.
6- Compare your new findings with the findings of previous studies.
7- Do not just repeat the results in different words in the Discussion section.
8- Please download similar published articles in our journal and write the manuscript according to that format.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 2 Jul 2021

Thank you for your recent revisions.
Your paper has now been evaluated again. According to the reviewers' and associate editor's comments, it needs some more revisions. Please make your revisions according to these comments. I would appreciate your making the revisions as soon as possible using Track Changes mode in MS Word and colored text.

3

Revision 2

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.

Dear Reviewer 1

Thanks for your valuable opinions and suggestions. I corrected all the asked points.

1- Data analysis should be integrated and summarized not in separate headline: Internal consistency Construct validity: convergent Confirmatory factor analysis
A: The headlines are deleted and integrated.
2- Study Design and Sampling and Participants should be integrated
A: This paragraph integrated and re-written according to the format of the journal.
3- In Discussion paragraphs 1 should be integrated with each other paragraph we haven't 2 line paragraph
A: The line 1 of discussion integrated with line 2.
4- "This is the first study which is done about this subject" is not a acceptable reply … We mean other studies that use other research that has been done on different samples /population/patients . So
A: The previous studies of CSP2 are added to the Discussion (Page 8, Paragraph 2, highlighted text)
5- Mention possible explanations for consistency and inconsistency results of your studies with others previous studies.
A: The consistency of the present manuscript with previous studies has been reviewed in revised file by adding the findings of the previous studies (Page 8, Paragraph 2, highlighted text).
6- Compare your new findings with the findings of others previous studies
A: The results of the present manuscript are compared with previous studies in revised file by adding the findings of the previous studies (Page 8, Last Paragraph, highlighted text).
7- Do not just repeat the results with different words in Discussion section.
A: The discussion part is re-written.
8- please download similar published articles in our journal and write the manuscript according to that format
A: Some parts of the present manuscript are re-written according to the journal's format (Inclusion criteria, Exclusion criteria, Limitations, and future research and conclusion).

Dear Reviewer 2

Thanks for your valuable opinions and suggestions. I corrected all the asked points.

- Replace quadrants with subscales in the Abstract, Results and Discussion section.

A: The quadrants are replaced with subscales in the abstract.

- Exclusion criteria?

A: The Exclusion criteria are added to the manuscript (Page 4, First 2 sentences).

- The discussion section is completely repetitive. You have repeated the results and subscales of the questionnaire in this section. Please rewrite it

A: The discussion part is re-written.

Thank you again for your time and attention

Sincerely

Corresponding Author

3 Revision 2

3 comments · 26 Aug 2021 – 15 Sep 2021

Referee 2 Reviewer

ACCEPT 26 Aug 2021

Accept

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 29 Aug 2021

dear authors
Thanks.
All peer review comments have been addressed.

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 15 Sep 2021

We have completed our review of your manuscript and are pleased to inform you that it is being considered for publication in the IJPBS. Note that the publication of your article will only be finalized upon your cooperation in the editorial process.
Thank you for your fine contribution. On behalf of the Editors of IJPBS, we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.