IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Volume 16 · Issue 2 · e112790

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Validity and Reliability of the Iranian Rapid Assessment for Psychiatric Illness Screening Instrument (IRA-PISI) in Primary Health Care

ali fakhari, Hossein Azizi, Mohsen Mostofi, Sona Sadeghpour, Mostafa Farahbakhsh

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
6 Feb 2021	2 Jan 2022	14 Apr 2022	10.5812/ijpbs-112790

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, Referee 2, Soheila Shahshahani, Referee 3, Associate Editor, Editor-in-C... 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 3, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 5
Authors' reply to reviewers 6
Reviewer and editor comments 12
3 **Revision 2** Editor-in-Chief 13
Authors' reply to reviewers 14
Reviewer and editor comments 17

1 Original submission

6 comments · 17 Feb 2021 – 22 Mar 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 17 Feb 2021

Thank you,
Line 105: It seems something went wrong: " DSM-2 ? Structured interview considered as gold standard." It should be DSM-5. Please check it.
Please mention the instruments you used to extract the items of the questionnaire.
Revise the text literally: line 141: "…who have high experts in the field and research"; please correct it to: who were highly experienced in the field and research…
Mention the mean and the range of years of experience for the experts.
In the discussion, you mentioned subscales; please identify each subscale by its related items.

Referee 2 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 25 Feb 2021

The comments are in the text. Please check them.

Soheila Shahshahani Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 2 Mar 2021

This is a good article, but I have some comments.
You also evaluated the reliability of the questionnaire; please consider it in the title.
The abstract is not informative. There is nothing about the gold standard test (psychiatric interview), the total score of the test, or the validity and reliability of the test in the abstract.
In the background, some sentences are vague (see the attached file).
The study design is not complete. How did you calculate the sample size? What were the inclusion or exclusion criteria?
In the literature review part, didn't you search WOS, Scopus, Google Scholar, etc.?
Add something about ethical codes in your study. The discussion part is weak.

Referee 3 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 19 Mar 2021

1- Title: Iranian or Persian should be added.
2- Please replace repeatability with stability.
3- Please download similar published articles in our journal and write the manuscript according to that format. The manuscript is poorly written and needs major modification. We have mentioned some writing errors.
4- In the abstract: Sample size, sampling method, design …
5- Please write your keywords in alphabetical order.
6- Keywords should be in accordance with MeSH.
7- References should be up to date.
8- In line 43, the sentence is unfinished.
9- Introduction: Justify the necessity for your study based on the gap in the previous findings.
10- The empirical background of the research has not been addressed; previous research should be briefly

reviewed critically.
11- Mention the details of the participants in the demographic characteristics table.
12- Sample size?
13- Sampling method?
14- How many medical centers were the participants selected from?
15- The Measure section is missing.
16- Summarize the method section and mention only the important points.
17- The procedures of your study were unclear.
18- Some characteristics of the questionnaire, for example, maximum and minimum scores.
19- Mention the limitations of the study.
20- Mention the study's suggestions.
21- The conclusion is missing.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 19 Mar 2021

dear author
Thank you, and please consider the points below:

Reviewer 1
This is a good article, but I have some comments.
You also evaluated the reliability of the questionnaire; please consider it in the title.
The abstract is not informative. There is nothing about the gold standard test (psychiatric interview), the total score of the test, or the validity and reliability of the test in the abstract.
In the background, some sentences are vague (see the attached file).
The study design is not complete. How did you calculate the sample size? What were the inclusion or exclusion criteria?
In the literature review part, didn't you search WOS, Scopus, Google Scholar, etc.?
Add something about ethical codes in your study. The discussion part is weak.

Reviewer 2

What is the theoretical frame of reference of this questionnaire?
How were these items generated?
What are the criteria for your study population?

Reviewer 3
Thank you.
Line 105: It seems something went wrong: " DSM-2 ? Structured interview considered as gold standard." It should be DSM-5. Please check it.
Please mention the instruments you used to extract the items of the questionnaire.
Revise the language of the text: line 141: "…who have high experts in the field and research", please correct this to: who were highly experienced in the field and research…
Mention the mean and the range of years of experience for the experts.
In the discussion, you mentioned subscales; please identify each subscale by its related items.

Reviewer 4
The comments are in the text. Please check them.

Reviewer 5
1- Title: Iranian or Persian should be added.

2- Please replace repeatability with stability.
3- Please download similar published articles in our journal and write the manuscript according to that format. The manuscript is poorly written and needs major modification. We have mentioned some of the writing errors.
4- In the abstract: Sample size, sampling method, design…
5- Please write your keywords in alphabetical order.
6- Keywords should be according to MeSH.
7- References should be up to date.
8- In line 43, the sentence is unfinished.
9- Introduction: Justify the necessity for your study based on the gap in the previous findings.
10- The empirical background of the research has not been addressed; previous research should be critically reviewed briefly.
11- Mention the details of the participants in the demographic characteristics table.
12- Sample size?
13- Sampling method?
14- How many medical centers were the participants selected from?
15- The Measures section is missing.
16- Summarize the method section and mention only important things.
17- The procedures of your study were unclear.
18- Some characteristics of the questionnaire, for example, the maximum and minimum scores.
19- Mention the limitations of the study.
20- Mention the suggestions of the study.
21- The conclusion is missing.

Editor-in-Chief MAJOR REVISION 22 Mar 2021

Your paper has been evaluated by external peer reviewers. Please revise your paper according to the reviewers' comments. I would appreciate it if you would make the revisions as soon as possible using Track Changes in MS Word and colored text.

After revision, authors are obliged to upload a Word file containing the reviewers' comments and their responses to all comments, one by one.

Besides, please pay attention to the word count limitation:
Word count limits are declared at 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 Editor-in-chief

Many thanks for your kind attention and time regarding our submitted manuscript entitled: **"Validity and Reliability of the Iranian Rapid Assessment for Psychiatric Illness Screening Instrument (IRA-PISI) in Primary Health Care"** Authors are thankful for the deep and thorough review and valuable comments. We have revised the manuscript based upon such comments raised by reviewers and then revisions were highlighted with yellow color. Moreover, the authors have also made some extra changes in the revised manuscript to all the concerns raised by reviewers. We hope you find the answers enough for accepting the paper and our revisions have improved the paper to a level of their satisfaction and the journal deserving.

Please find authors answers point by point, as follows:

Best Regards

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
dear author
Thank you and Please consider the below points:

Reviewer 1
This is good article but I have some comments.
You also evaluated the reliability of the questionnaire; please consider it in the title.

Authors reply: Many thanks for your comment. The reliability was added in the title.

The abstract is not informative. There is nothing about the gold standard test (psychiatric interview), the total score of the test, validity and reliability of the test in the abstract.

Authors reply: Many thanks for your valuable comment. The sample size and gold standard and total score of questionnaire, validity and reliability of the questionnaire were mentioned in the "Abstract".

In the background, some sentences are vague (see the attached file).

Authors reply: Many thanks for your comment. The “Background was read and corrected based on comments on the attached file.

The study design is not complete. How did you calculate the sample size? What was the inclusion or exclusion criteria?

The sample size was determined based on p=.2, α: .95, and d=0.2p by Cochran formula.

Inclusion criteria was aged 18-60 and informed consent and exclusion criteria was considered mental disability, and major physical illness such as cancer, etc.

In the literature review part, didn’t you searched WOS, Scopus, google scholar, etc.?

Authors reply: Many thanks for your comment. This study wasn’t a systematic review, it was combined most expert comments with literature. The experts (Psychiatrists) have informed about various psychiatric screening and diagnosis tools. On the other hand Medline (via Ovid) Cochrane Library and Psych info covered almost all medical records.

Add something about ethical codes in your study.

Authors reply: Many thanks. In the method section a section “Ethics Approval” was added and described the details.

Discussion part is weak.

Authors reply: Many thanks. Discussion was strengthened with new references from this journal and others and compared with various studies.

.

Reviewer 2

What is the theoretical frame of reference of this questionnaire?

Authors reply: Many thanks. In the first line health care system in particular PHC such as outpatients visiting by family physicians and/or healthcare providers there is not a rapid and concise tool for screening common psychiatric disorders. Therefore, mental illness patients have been under-detected or these outpatients referred to the next levels (most psychiatrists) by family physicians. The implications of this issue are patients' overload and congestion at the third level of the healthcare system.

How these items generate?

Authors reply: Thanks for your comment. We described and revised for clearness this section in the Methods/Expert comments by yellow color.

What is the criteria of your study population?
Authors reply: Many thanks for your comment. The eligibility criteria was described in the main text by tracking.

Reviewer 3
Thank you,
Line 105: it seems something went wrong:" DSM-2 ? Structured interview considered as gold standard." It should be DSM-5. Please check it.

Authors reply: Many thanks. We used DSM-5 as a gold standard. It was revised.

Please mention the instruments you used to extract the items of the questionnaire

Authors reply: many thanks for your comment. It was used tools including PRIME-MD, PHQ9 and 15, K10, …

Revise the text literally: line 141: "…who have high experts in the field and research", please to be corrected as: who were highly experienced in the field and research…

Authors reply: Many thanks. The sentence was revised and highlighted.

Mention the mean and the range of years of experience for the experts

Authors reply: Thanks for your comment. Twelve psychiatrists were used for item generating. The work experience distribution for experts was 16.11 (SD=6.98) years. We added this data in the "Methods/Expert comments" section.

In discussion, you declared subscales, please identify each subscale by related items.

Authors reply: Many thanks. Subscales were added in the "discussion".

Reviewer 4

the comments are in the text. please check them.

Authors reply: Many thanks for your comment. We revised the manuscript point by point based on such comments raised in the file. The revisions were highlighted.

Reviewer 5

1- Title: Iranian or Persian should be added

Authors reply: Many thanks. The “Iranian” was added in the title.

2- Please replaced repeatability with stability

Authors reply: Many thanks. Repeatability replaced by stability.

3- Please download similar published articles in our journal and write the manuscript according to that format. the manuscript wrote in a poor manner. And need major modification, we mentioned some of miswriting

Authors reply: Many thanks. The manuscript conformed based on Journal format and edited by an expert colleague.

4- In abstract : Sample size, sampling method, design …

Authors reply: Many thanks. The sample size and sampling method was added.

5- Please write your keywords in an alphabetic turn

Authors reply: Many thanks. It was revised.

6- Keywords should be according to MeSH

Authors reply: The Keywords were revised based on Mesh.

7- References should be up to date

Authors reply: Many thanks. The references were up to dated.

8- In line 43 the sentence is unfinished

Authors reply: Many thanks. The sentence was revised and revisions highlighted.

9- Introduction: Justify the necessity for your study based on the gap in the previous findings

Authors reply: Many thanks. The study gap was highlighted in the Introduction.

10- The empirical background of the research has not been addressed, previous researches should be critically reviewed briefly.

Authors reply: Many thanks. The Introduction was revised and corrected by Dear Dr. reviewer comments. We added the previous findings and gaps in the background.

11- Mention the details of the participants, in the demographics characteristic table

Authors reply: thanks for your comment. In the “Results” section, we added some demographic characteristic of participants.

12- Sample size?

Authors reply: Many thanks. The sample size was determined based on p=.2, α: .95, and d=0.2p by Cochran formula. We described the sample size and sampling process in the Study Design.

13- Sampling method?

Authors reply: Many thanks. Due to this study was performed to validated a tool and not need to generalizability, convenience sampling was used.

14- How many medical centers were the participants selected from?

Authors reply: Many thanks. Three medical centers including community health center, Emam Khomeini Clinic, and private clinic were selected in Tabriz.

15- Measure section have missed

Authors reply: Many thanks. Measurements were mentioned in the main text (Method/ validity and reliability) however to improve and well-describing of the manuscript it was added in the Method section.

16- Summarize method section and mention just important things

Authors reply: Many thanks. The “Method” was revised and corrected.

17- Procedures of your study was unclear

Authors reply: Many thanks. The Method section was read and revise.

18- Some characteristic of the questionnaire for example maximum and the minimum score

Authors reply: Many thanks. The minimum and maximum score for questionnaire ranged 14-70. It was described in the “Results/content validity” section. However, we already mentioned questionnaire scoring in the “Cutoff point”/Result section. This sentence highlighted by yellow font.

19- Mention limitation of the study

Authors reply: Many thanks. Limitation section was added in the end of Discussion.

20- Mention suggestions of the study

Authors reply: Many thanks. It was mentioned in the end of the conclusion.

21- Conclusion have missed

Authors reply: Many thanks. Conclusion was added.

2 Revision 1

3 comments · 14 Nov 2021 – 18 Nov 2021

Referee 3 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 14 Nov 2021

dear author

1. Please download similar published articles in our journal and write the manuscript according to that format. Many of the headings are redundant and should be integrated. For example, in the discussion, "Sensitivity and Specificity of Questionnaire" and … are redundant; there are also redundant headings in the method section.
2. The discussion section is weak, and you have repeated the results in this section. Please rewrite it.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 14 Nov 2021

dear author

1. Please download similar published articles in our journal and write the manuscript according to that format. Many headings are redundant and should be integrated. For example, in the discussion, "Sensitivity and Specificity of Questionnaire" and … are redundant; there are also redundant headings in the method section.
2. The discussion section is weak, and you have repeated the results in this section. Please rewrite it.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 18 Nov 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. The full manuscript file must be highlighted to indicate revised 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 Editor-in-Chief.,

Many thanks for your kind attention and time regarding our submitted manuscript " **Validity and Reliability of the Iranian Rapid Assessment for Psychiatric Illness Screening Instrument (IRA-PISI) in Primary Health Care"** Authors are thankful to the deep and thorough review and valuable comments. We have revised the manuscript based upon such comments and highlighted by yellow color. We hope you find the answers enough for accepting the paper and our revision has improved the paper to a level of their satisfaction and the journal deserving.

Best regards

Please find the point by point rebuttal below

Editor comments #

1. Please download similar published articles in our journal and write the manuscript according to that format. Many headlines are redundant and should be integrated. For example in discussion "Sensitivity and Specificity of Questionnaire" and … are redundancy also in the method section

Authors reply: Many thanks for your time and comment. We revised and corrected the manuscript based on your comment and a similar published article in journal.

2. The discussion section is weak and you have repeated the results in this section. Please rewrite it.

Authors reply: Thanks for your comment. The discussion was revised and re-written again using literature and we also explained the practical implications of the present study in health care systems.

Revisions highlighted by yellow color.

Reviewer Comments:

Reviewer 1:

1. Please download similar published articles in our journal and write the manuscript according to that format. Many of headlines are redundant and should be integrated. For example in discussion "Sensitivity and Specificity of Questionnaire" and … are redundancy also in the method section

Authors reply: Many thanks. We revised and corrected the manuscript based on your comment and also according to the similar published articles in the journal. Headlines were revised and removed or revised redundant.

2. The discussion section is weak and you have repeated the results in this section. Please rewrite it.

Authors reply: Thanks for your comment. The discussion was revised and re-written again using literature and we also explained the practical implications of the present study in health care systems.

Revisions highlighted by yellow color.

Reviewer 2:
The discussion section is weak and you have repeated the results in this section. Please rewrite it.

Authors reply: Thanks for your comment. The discussion was revised and re-written again using literature and we also explained the practical implications of the present study in health care systems.

Revisions highlighted by yellow color.

We thank you once again for your time and for the critical comments and constructive feedback. We believe that the current manuscript reads well and have improved significantly in its quality. We hope that the issues raised by you are addressed by us and wish to get a favorable reply from you.

Best Regards

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 14 Apr 2022

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 14 Apr 2022

We have completed our review of your manuscript and are pleased to inform you that it is considered for publication in the IJPBS. Note that the publication of your article will only be finalized upon your cooperation with 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.