IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Volume 17 · Issue 1 · e122454

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Psychometric Properties of the Persian Version of the Early Life Experiences Scale (ELES)

Sajad Khanjani, Esmaeil Mousavi Asl, Aliakbar Foroughi, Mohabt Kazemini, Moslem Rajabi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
28 May 2022	8 Nov 2022	16 Dec 2022	10.5812/ijpbs-122454

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, sahel khakpoor, Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2

2 **Revision 1** Yousef Asmari Bardezard, Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 7

Authors' reply to reviewers 8

Reviewer and editor comments 12

1 Original submission

5 comments · 10 Jul 2022 – 7 Sep 2022

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 10 Jul 2022

Line 54-56: It seems that “intimacy” is not correct in this sentence. Please check the sentence.
In line 56: Please clarify the meaning of injuries in this sentence or replace it with a more suitable word.
Please revise the language throughout the text; for example, in line 60, “increases” should be omitted. Some of the sentences are not comprehensible.
Please check the titles of the instruments.
Lines 62- 63 should be revised both in content and writing.
What do you mean by “new culture” in line 83?
The necessity of this study and the choice of this scale are not explained sufficiently.
Why didn’t you administer a depression scale, since it was more related to your scale than borderline personality traits?

sahel khakpoor Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 16 Aug 2022

The manuscript entitled " The psychometric properties of the Persian version of the Early Life Experiences Scale" is a cross-sectional study that aims to investigate the validity and reliability of the Persian version of this scale. The paper proposes an interesting issue; however, it also suffers from some problems that should be resolved in order to improve the paper.
1. Although the authors report information regarding the “early life experiences” and their consequences, it seems that they mean mostly negative experiences (page 4, line 33,45). It is better to distinguish between early experiences that can cause psychopathology and other experiences by using words like negative early life experiences (as mentioned on page 4, line 42).
2. In general, it was explained that negative early life experiences can cause psychopathology; however, it is better to consider the theoretical foundations of the Early Life Experiences Scale, like “social rank theory”:
a. Gilbert, P., Allan, S., Brough, S., Melley, S., & Miles, J. (2002). Anhedonia and positive affect: relationship to social rank, defeat and entrapment. Journal of Affective Disorders, 71, 141–151.

3. Various scales were introduced for evaluating early experiences (page 5, lines 65-70). It is not clear why this number of scales is mentioned (9 scales!). It is better to select some of them and explain the superiority of the Gilbert scale or how it differs from them.
4. What does the author mean by “a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1¼almost never to 5¼almost always”?
5. I would recommend adding "Data analysis" sections to make it clearer how missing data were addressed and how the data were analyzed.
6. The authors should explain the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the study.
7. In the Result section, the authors report internal consistency and test-retest analyses as two separate parts. Given that reliability refers to the consistency of a measure and that there are three types of consistency—over time (test-retest reliability), across items (internal consistency like Cronbach’s alphas), and across different researchers (inter-rater reliability)—I would recommend reporting these parts under the “Reliability Analysis” subtitle.
8. The factor analysis result was reported under the subtitle of “Validity”, which is confusing! (page 8, line 151-159). The validity of ELES was reported in lines 167-170.

Minor points:
• In tables, it is more common to report p-values as **P<0.01, *P<0.05 (not *Correlation is significant at 0.05 level, **Correlation is significant at 0.01 level).
• References should be written in Vancouver format, not APA format. You may need to check your referencing software (55,62,63).
• I would recommend some extra proofreading to pick up small typos and grammatical errors. This will help with the ease of reading the manuscript.

Referee 2 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 31 Aug 2022

In the Abstract section
1- Mention the time and places of the study in the Abstract.
2- "good internal consistency and good test-retest reliability" Please provide statistical indexes.
3- " convergent validity, ELES showed a positive and significant correlation" Please provide statistical indexes.... Do the rest in the same way.
4- Mention the fit indexes of CFA.
5- Keywords should be consistent with MeSH.
In the Introduction section
6- The first three paragraphs refer to the same topic, so summarize and merge these three paragraphs.
In the method section
7- "students of Iran University of Science" !!!!!!
8- Eligibility criteria?
9- Your English translation was not appropriate and contained a grammatical error. Please revise the entire manuscript to use academic, native-level English.
10- Summarize the tools section and report only important information. Also report the psychometric properties of the Persian version of this questionnaire.
• The psychometric properties of the instrument are not reported correctly. Please report the following accurately.
1. Name of the tool manufacturer and year.
2. Number of items, subscales, and scoring.
3. Numerical indexes and types of validity and reliability in the original form, followed by the same information for the Persian form.
4. Report Cronbach's alpha in your research.
Results
11- Is this the title of table 1? "The mean, standard deviation and correlation of ELES subscale are shown in Table 1."
Discussion
1- Mention possible explanations for consistencies and inconsistencies between the results of your studies and those of other previous studies.
2- Compare your new findings with the findings of other previous studies.
3- Future suggestions
References
4- References should be updated.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 31 Aug 2022

dear author
Reviewer 1
The manuscript entitled " The psychometric properties of the Persian version of the Early Life Experiences Scale" is a cross-sectional study that aims to investigate the validity and reliability of the Persian version of this scale. The paper addresses an interesting issue; however, it also suffers from some problems that should be resolved in order to improve the paper.
1. Although the authors report information regarding “early life experiences” and their consequences, it seems that they mean mostly negative experiences (page 4, line 33,45). It is better to distinguish between early experiences that can cause psychopathology and other experiences by using words like negative early life experiences (as mentioned on page 4, line 42).
2. In general, it was explained that negative early life experiences can cause psychopathology; however, it is better to consider the theoretical foundations of the Early Life Experiences Scale, like “social rank theory”:
a. Gilbert, P., Allan, S., Brough, S., Melley, S., & Miles, J. (2002). Anhedonia and positive affect: relationship to social rank, defeat, and entrapment. Journal of Affective Disorders, 71, 141–151.

3. Various scales were introduced for evaluating early experiences (page 5, lines 65-70). The reason for mentioning this number of scales (9 scales!) is not clear. It is better to select some of them and explain the superiority of the Gilbert scale over them or how it differs from them.
4. What does the author mean by “a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1¼almost never to 5¼almost always”?
5. I would recommend adding a "Data analysis" section to make it clearer how missing data were addressed and how the data were analyzed.
6. The authors should explain the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the study.
7. In the Result section, the authors report internal consistency and test-retest analysis as two separate parts. Given that reliability refers to the consistency of a measure and there are three types of consistency—over time (test-retest reliability), across items (internal consistency, like Cronbach’s alpha), and across different researchers (inter-rater reliability)—I would recommend reporting these parts under the “Reliability Analysis” subtitle.
8. The factor analysis result was reported under the subtitle “Validity”, which is confusing (page 8, line 151-159)! Lines 167-170 report the validity of ELES.

Minor points:
• In tables, it is more common to report p-values as **P<0.01, *P<0.05 (not *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level, **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level).
• References should be written in Vancouver format, not APA format. You may need to check your referencing software (55,62,63).
• I would recommend some extra proofreading to pick up small typos and grammatical errors. This will help with the ease of reading the manuscript.

Reviewer 2
Line 54-56: It seems that “intimacy” is not correct in this sentence. Please check the sentence.
In line 56, please clarify: “injuries” in this sentence needs to be elaborated on or replaced with a more suitable word.
Please revise the language throughout the text; for example, in line 60, “increases” should be omitted. Some of the sentences are not comprehensible.
Please check the title of the instruments.
Lines 62- 63 should be revised for both content and writing.
What do you mean by “new culture” in line 83?
The necessity of this study and the choice of this scale are not explained sufficiently.

Why didn't you administer a depression scale, since it was more related to your scale than borderline personality traits?

Review 3
In Abstract section
1- Mention the time and places of the study in the Abstract.
2- "good internal consistency and good test-retest reliability": please provide statistical indices.
3- " convergent validity, ELES showed a positive and significant correlation": please provide statistical indices.... Do the rest in the same way.
4- Mention the fit indices for CFA.
5- Keywords should be consistent with MeSH.
In Introduction section
6- The first three paragraphs refer to the same topic, so summarize and merge these three paragraphs.
In method
7- "students of Iran University of Science" !!!!!!
8- Eligibility criteria?
9- Your English translation was not appropriate and had grammatical errors. Please revise the entire manuscript to meet academic writing standards and read naturally in English.
10- Summarize the tools section and report only important information. Also, report the psychometric properties of the Persian version of this questionnaire.
• The psychometric properties of the instrument are not reported correctly. Please report the following accurately.
1. The instrument developer's name and the year of development.
2. Number of items, subscales, and scoring.
3. Numerical indices and types of validity and reliability in the original version, followed by the same information for the Persian version.
4. Report Cronbach's alpha in your research.
Results
11- Is this the title of table 1? "The mean, standard deviation and correlation of ELES subscale are shown in Table 1."
Discussion
1- Mention possible explanations for the consistency and inconsistency of the results of your studies with those of previous studies.
2- Compare your new findings with the findings of previous studies.
3- Suggestions for future research.
References
4- References should be updated.
Please download the attached file; some comments are presented in the attached files.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 7 Sep 2022

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

After revising the manuscript, authors are required 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 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.

:Reviewer 1	Reviewer Comments	respond to the reviewer
In Abstract section	Mention Time and places of study in Abstract -1	A sample of 231 students from Iran University of medical sciences who were chosen based on the convenience sampling method in 2019-2020
	good internal consistency and good test-retest " -2 .reliability" please statistical indexes	.good test-retest reliability (>.70)
	convergent validity, ELES showed a positive and " -3 significant correlation" please statistical indexes…. Do the rest in the same way	Concerning convergent validity, ELES showed a positive and significant correlation with DERS(r=.26) and STB (r=.37). It also showed a negative and significant relationship with self-compassion(r=-45), which indicates the desired divergent validity
	Mention Fitness indexes of CFA -4	(CFI: .96, NFI: .95, RMSEA: .08).
	Keywords should be according to MeSH -5	validity and reliability, Life Experiences, Scale
In Introduction section	The first three paragraphs refer to the same topic, -6 so summarize and merge these three paragraphs	The first three paragraphs were completely rewritten and highlighted in the original file of the article
In method	!!!!! "students of Iran University of Science" -7	Modified in methodological section as follows:The study population consisted of all students of Iran University of medical .sciences in the academic year 2019-2020
	?Eligibility criteria -8	Inclusion criteria: Iranian University of Medical Sciences Students, Awareness of Research Objectives, Informed Consent to Participate in Research. Exclusion criteria: More than 30% of questions are unanswered, specific response patterns such as equal answering even questions or marking an option in consecutive questions.
	your English translation was not appropriate and -9 had the grammatical mistake. Please revise all of .manuscript according to academic and native writing	The article was revised grammatically
	Summarize the tools section and report just -10 important things. And report the psychometric properties of the Persian version of this questionnaire	The characteristics of all research tools were completely modified in the methodological section
Results	Is it the titile of table 1? "The mean, standard -11 deviation and correlation of ELES subscale are shown .".in Table 1	

Discussion	1- Mention possible explanations for consistency and inconsistency results of your studies with others previous studies. 2- Compare your new findings with the findings of others previous studies. 3- Future suggestions	The article discussion was rewritten so that it could cover comments
References	References should be updated	References updated.
:Reviewer 2	**Reviewer Comments**	**respond to the reviewer**
	Line 54-56: it seems that "intimacy" is not correct in this sentence. Please check the sentence	The word "intimacy" has been deleted
	In line 56: please clarify: injuries in this sentence needs to be elaborated or displaced by a more suitable word	Line 56 was rewritten.
	Please check the title of the instruments	Tools title modified
	Lines 62- 63 should be revised both in content and writing	According to the comments of other reviewers, this section was changed and removed
	What do you mean by "new culture" in line 83?	To investigate the scale in different cultures with the culture in which the scale was built
	The necessity of this study and choosing this scale are nor explained sufficiently.	In the last paragraph, the introduction section fully explains the importance of choosing this tool.
	Why didn't you administer a depression scale? Since it was more related to your scale than borderline personality traits.	The necessity of using the borderline personality symptoms scale is explained according to its relationship with the first experiences and discussion. However, we could use other tools, such as depression, as outlined in the limitations section of the article.
:Reviewer 3	**Reviewer Comments**	**respond to the reviewer**
	1. Although the authors report information regarding the "early life experiences" and it consequences, it seems that they mean mostly negative experiences (page 4, line 33,45). It is better to distinguish between early experiences that can cause psychopathology and other experiences by using words like negative early life experiences (as mentioned on page 4, line 42)	The first 3 paragraphs were completely rewritten and emphasized the relationship between negative initial experiences and psychopathology
	2. In general, it was explained that negative early life experiences can cause psychopathology, however, it is better to consider the theoretical foundations of The Early Life Experiences Scale, like "social rank theory": *a. Gilbert, P., Allan, S., Brough, S., Melley, S., & Miles, J. (2002). Anhedonia and positive affect: relationship to social rank, defeat and entrapment. Journal of Affective Disorders, 71,*	The theory of social ranking is explained in paragraph 4.

	141–151.	
	3. Various scales were introduced for evaluating early experiences (page 5, lines 65-70). It is not clear what is the reason for mentioning this number of scales (9 scales!). It is better to select some of them and explain the superiority or differentiation of the Gilbert scale compared to them.	In line 48 to 51, it has removed a number of scales that measure early experiences, and the difference between the scale of early experiences and these tools has been explained.
	4. What dose the author mean by "a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1¼almost never to 5¼almost always"?	It was wrong and corrected.
	5. I would recommend adding "Data analysis" sections to make it more clear how missing data were addressed and how the data was analyzed.	The data were cleaned and screened. Missing data were <5% of the data set. The structural validity of the ELES was examined using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Cronbach's alpha was used to calculate the internal consistency of ELES. Test-retest reliability was calculated using Intraclass correlations coefficient (ICC). Divergent and convergent validity was investigated examining the Pearson correlations between the ELES scores and STB, SCS-SF, and DERS,. Data were analysed using .SPSS-20 and LISREL version 8.80
	6. The authors should explain the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the study.	. Inclusion criteria: Iranian University of Medical Sciences Students, Awareness of Research Objectives, Informed Consent to Participate in Research. Exclusion criteria: More than 30% of questions are unanswered, specific response patterns such as equal answering even questions or marking an option in consecutive questions
	7. In the Result section authors report internal consistency and Test-Retest analyze as two separated parts. Given that reliability refers to the consistency of a measure and there are three types of consistency: over time (test-retest reliability), across items (internal consistency like Cronbach's alphas), and across different researchers (inter-rater reliability), I would recommend reporting these part as the "Reliability Analysis" subtitle.	Internal consistency and *Test-Retest* were separated from each other
	8. The factor analysis result was reported under the subtitle of "Validity", which is confusing! (page 8, line 151-159). Lines 167-170 were reported validity of ELES.	The result of the factor analysis, which was confusing, was rewritten and corrected.
:Minor points	*1- In tables it is more common to refer to p value like **P<0.01, *P<0.05 (not *Correlation is significant at 0.05 level, **Correlation is significant at 0.01 level)*	Modified in the article and highlighted

	2- In tables it is more common to refer to p value like **P<0.01, *P<0.05 (not *Correlation is significant at 0.05 level, **Correlation is significant at 0.01 level) 3- • I would recommend some extra proofreading to pick up small typos and grammatical errors. This will help with the ease of reading the manuscript.	

2 Revision 1

4 comments · 24 Nov 2022 – 16 Dec 2022

Yousef Asmari Bardezard Reviewer — ACCEPT 24 Nov 2022

Greetings .
All the requested points have been addressed, and there are no impediments to acceptance.

Referee 2 Reviewer — ACCEPT 28 Nov 2022

accept

Associate Editor — ACCEPT 30 Nov 2022

Thanks.

Editor-in-Chief — ACCEPT 16 Dec 2022

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 process.
Thank you for your fine contribution. On behalf of the Editors of IJPBS, we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.