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://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/ijpbs-112980
Published in: IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 16(3); e112980

Peer Review Report for "Psychometric Study Using Item Response Theory of an Instrument Developed for Assessment of Iranian Mental Health Problems"

Author(s): Masoumeh Dejman, Monir Baradaran Eftekhari, Katayoun Falahat, Zohreh Mahmoodi, Mojgan Padyab, Ameneh Setareh Forouzan

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 11 Jul 2021
Revised Date: 7 May 2022
Accepted Date: 28 Jul 2022

Revision (0)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 28 Jul 2021

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:

please explain why you added or removed some items in each scale; I mean culturally as you stated in the discussion.
How and based on which criteria participants were selected from the list of the community health records?
Did you pair the participants in subgroups? If yes, please explain.

Kind regards,

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 4 Aug 2021

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:

Title of Manuscript: Validation Study Using Item Response Theory of an Instrument

Developed for assessing Iranian Mental health Problems

Comments to Author:

Overall this study described the results of the study with the title of “Validation Study Using Item Response Theory of an Instrument Developed for Assessing Iranian Mental Health Problems”. This article is good and valuable. However, several revisions are needed to ensure a quality manuscript.

Title

Please add the word "reliability" in the title.

Abstract

-For the first time, the abbreviation words “OCD” should be mentioned in full.

Introduction

-You can use this similar study in the introduction or other sections.

“Nejatian, M., Tehrani, H., Momeniyan, V., et al. A modified version of the mental health literacy scale (MHLS) in Iranian people. BMC Psychiatry 21, 53 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-021-03050-3”

Methods

-Lines 76 to 81 do not seem appropriate for this section. This information should be used in the introduction, not the method.

- Have the tools used in Iran been translated? If they have not been translated, please describe the process of translation and cultural adaptation of these tools in the text.

-In the “Yale-Brown Obsessive-Compulsive Scale (Y-BOCS)” section, add the original reference on line 101.

-In the “Beck Depression Inventory Scale” section, add the original reference on line 109.

Please provide more information about the “Function Checklist” tool. It is vague.

-Why did you choose 120 people with a disorder and 80 people without a disorder? Please explain in the text.

-Move lines 176 to 204 before the Measures section (Line 95).

-Explain the method of determining the sample size.

-Inclusion and exit criteria should be stated exactly.

-You mentioned in the abstract that you used Amos software but did not give any explanation in the analysis section. If used, the full description must be provided. Please check.

-Line 181 states that the sample size of healthy individuals was 80 (N=80), but in the results section it was 40. Please check.

Results

-In lines 260 to 265 for the cut-off point, based on what criteria is “sensitivity and specificity” obtained ?? Explain.

-In Table 3, in the education section, what do you mean by Primary level, Intermediate level, and High level?? Please state more clearly.

-Please list the abbreviations in the table title in full below the table.

-Please include all final questionnaire questions in the attached files.

- In the results section, you have stated the results related to the reliability of the tool, but in the method section, you have not mentioned any explanation about the reliability. Please correct.

Discussion

-The limitations of the present study and research suggestions should be added in the last

part of the discussion.
Conclusion
-Please explain the conclusion section with more details. For example, state exactly how many questions the final tool has and how many sections it has. The number of questions in each section should be stated in parentheses.

Kind regards,

¬ **REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 30 Aug 2021

Dear AE,

The article is relatively good. I have written some suggestions in the article file that you can solve. My opinion is to agree to acceptance.

Kind regards

¬ **REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 5 Oct 2021

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:

1- Please replace subjects with participants
2- Please note Keywords according to mesh and in alphabet turn
3- Please edit the manuscript according to native English writing. English writing is poor
4- In the method section please summarize Participants, Measure, and Procedure
5- In the results section please mention in the below tables some notes (e.g Note. β = difficulty parameter; σβ = standard error for difficulty parameter; α = discrimination parameter; σα = standard error for discrimination parameter)
6- Please attach the scale in the appendix
7- Please download a similar article and revise the manuscript (the framework of the manuscript is confused)
8- Please mention limitations
9- Please mention suggestions for future study

Kind regards

¬ **Yazdan Naderi Rajeh**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 5 Oct 2021

Dear EIC,

The manuscript has been studied, and some comments should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.

Kind regards,
AE

Mehran Zarghami: EIC | **Revision (0)** 7 Oct 2021

Dear Authors,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript for consideration for publication in the Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences. External peer reviewers have evaluated your paper. Please revise it according to their comments. I would appreciate it if you could do the revisions as soon as possible.

After revision, authors are obliged to upload reviewers' comments in a Word file in which they reply to each comment individually. Please note that the full manuscript file must be highlighted to indicate revised texts.

Besides, please pay attention to the word count limitation:
Word count limits are declared in this link: https://brieflands.com/journals/ij-psychiatry-and-behavioral-sciences/knowledgebase/category/tree#word_count_limits

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

Kind Regards,
EIC

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.

Authors' answers	Authors' reply
Reviewer 1	
please explain why you added or removed some items in each scale; I mean culturally as you stated in discussion	Typically, the selected instrument included symptoms/ activities that did not emerge in the qualitative data. The study team reviewed the selected instruments together with the qualitative data. When a symptom, activity, or other concept was described in the qualitative data, the words/idiom were cut and pasted into the instrument, with minor adjustments for grammar as needed. The process continued in this way for all symptoms and concepts in the instrument that had an equivalent in the qualitative data, thereby ensuring that, as much as possible, the vocabulary of the target population was represented in the adapted instrument. The final complete version was then reviewed by representatives of the target population in a session to provide feedback and correct any mistakes in content and grammar. A similar review was then conducted with the interviewers as part of their training prior to testing the instrument.
How and based on which criteria participants were selected from the list of the community health records?	clients over the age of 18 years old living in Semnan province who visited the selected health centers
Did you pair the participants in subgroups? If yes, please explain.	No, we didn’t pair the participants. At least 40 respondents for each mental health problem (depression, anxiety, OCD, substance abuse), and 40 healthy respondents.
Review er 2	
The article is relatively good.	Thank you very much
Reviewer 3	
Title Please add the word "reliability" in the title.	Validation changed to psychometric (validity and reliability)
Abstract -For the first time, the abbreviation words “OCD” should be mentioned in full.	Ok. Corrected. thanks
Introduction -You can use this similar study in the introduction or other sections. “Nejatian, M., Tehrani, H., Momeniyan, V. et al. A modified version of the mental health literacy scale (MHLS) in Iranian people. BMC Psychiatry 21, 53 (2021	Ok . added.
Methods -Lines 76 to 81 do not seem appropriate for this section. This information should be used in the introduction, not the method.	Ok. This part of the method was moved to the introduction
Have the tools used in Iran been	These tools had been translated in Iran.

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) 23 Dec 2021

Dear AE,

The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.

Kind regards,

¬ **REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 24 Jan 2022

Dear AE,

Thanks for inviting me for the review. There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:

The paper seems revised and I believe that it is well revised.
I just feel that the reliability part is so blurred. Some test-retest or inter/intra-rater reliability is needed. These items usually are reported using ICC or Kappa.

Kind regards,

¬ **REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 20 Feb 2022

Dear AE,

please explain and clarify the comments in the text.
please correct the grammatical errors.
please specify your statistical analysis test in the methodology section.
you didn't explain criterion validity and the use of Item response theory.

Kind regards,

¬ **REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 14 Mar 2022

Dear AE,

There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:

please add "Iranian Mental Health Problems subscales" in Tables 2, 3, 4 Iranian Mental health Problems subscales
1- Compare your new findings with the findings of other previous studies.
2- Mention possible explanations for the consistency and inconsistent results of your studies with other previous studies.
3- Use newer references.

Kind regards

Yazdan Naderi Rajeh: Associate Editor | **Revision (1)** 14 Mar 2022

Dear EIC,

The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggested some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.

Kind regards,
AE

Mehran Zarghami: EIC | **Revision (1)** 19 Mar 2022

Dear Authors,

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 do your revisions according to these comments. I appreciate you to do the revisions as soon as possible. The full manuscript file must be highlighted to indicate revised texts.

Kind regards,
EIC

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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.

Reviewer 1:
please add "Iranian Mental health Problems subscales" in table 2 , 3 , 4 Iranian Mental health Problems subscales
Answer: corrected
1- Compare your new findings with the findings of others previous studies.
Answer: it was done
2- Mention possible explanations for consistency and inconsistency results of your studies with others previous studies.
Answer: it was done
3- Use newer references.
Answer: it was done

Reviewer 2:
the reliability part is so blurred. Some test-retest or inter/intra-rater reliability is needed. These items usually are reported using ICC or Kappa.
Answer: Thanks for reviewer's comment. The primary goal of our study was to examine the performance of the common mental health screening instrument. Using item-reduction method, we mainly focused on establishing a valid instrument and assessing difficulty and discrimination parameters of the instrument and in general how it performs in the Iranian context. Therefore, we only used internal consistency reliability test using Cronbach's alpha. Given that this is the first study in Iran, future research may need to elaborate more details of the psychometric properties of this instrument using test-retest and inter/intra-rater reliability analyses. Can the Editor please advise if this should be mentioned in the limitations?

Reviewer 3:
thank you for making corrections. Please add "age over 18 years old" in line 160 in inclusion criteria.
Answer: it was done

Reviewer 4:
1. Explain and clarify the comments in the text.
2. Correct the grammatical errors.
3. Specify your statistical analysis test in methodology section.
5. You didn't explain about criterion validity and use of Item response theory.
Answer: it was done

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 19 Jun 2022

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

Yazdan Naderi Rajeh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 19 Jun 2022

Dear EIC,

Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.

Kind regards,
AE

Mehran Zarghami: EIC | **Revision** (2) 28 Jul 2022

Dear Authors,

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 with the editorial processing.
Thank you for your kind contribution. On behalf of the Editors of IJPBS, we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.

Kind regards,
EIC