**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-122488
Published in: IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 16(2); e122488

# Peer Review Report for "An Instrument for Assessing Evolutionary or Distal Causes of Psychiatric Disorders: Psychometric Properties of Persian Version of Evolutionary Fitness Scale"

**Author(s):** Mohammad Ghazanfari, fahimeh fathali lavasani, Alireza Noroozi, Hadi Samadi, Mahmood Dehghani

**Review Timeline:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Submit Date: | 16 Jan 2022 |
| Revised Date: | 18 Apr 2022 |
| Accepted Date: | 7 May 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) — 31 Jan 2022

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

Abstract
1- In the background, mention the tool and its normative necessity.
2- Refer to the fit indicators in the abstract.
3- Scale 6 is a one-factor and you have mentioned two factors in the abstract. Make it correct.
4- The results should be summarized.
5- You mentioned in the abstract that this scale can be used in clinical practice, but you did not mention it in the discussion.
Body article
6- Express inclusion and exclusion criteria and ethical considerations.
7- in the introduction what is the advantage of this tool over other evolutionary tools?
8- Point to the need to standardize scales in other cultures.

9- Use the word population instead of society.
10- What was your criterion for choosing the self-esteem scale and dass-21?
11- briefly mention who made this scale and how many dimensions it has.
12- Subscales should be summarized.
13- Explain the research method more.
14- The tables do not conform to the journal format and need to be modified.
15- In the discussion section, refer to the main study indicators.
16- Some references do not conform to the journal format and should be modified.
17- Conflicts of interest and acknowledgments should be mentioned at the end of the article.
18- Explain convergent and divergent validity.
19- In the last part of the discussion, suggestions for further studies should be provided.
20- The limitation of the study should be methodological.
21- In the introduction, briefly mention who made this scale and how many dimensions it has.

Kind regards,

**REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 18 Feb 2022

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

I have studied your valuable work. the scale you have chosen to standardize is a necessary and valuable tool for the field. I have mentioned some comments and questions in the text. please consider them in the final version.

Kind regards,

**Somayeh Zamirinejad**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 20 Feb 2022

Dear EIC,

Two referees have commented on the paper, and here I summarize my assessment based on the consistency of their reviews and my own reading of the paper.
Reviewer #2 requested more transparency about the one-factor and two-factor model that authors have reported. And I agree with them that the rationale and fit indices for those two measurements should be explained in a clear and comprehensible way.
In this regard, I looked up the scale's original paper, their report indicated that the items loaded on 2 separate factors: "personal adaptedness" and "partner and offspring fitness". There was no mention of the 7 subscales that is mentioned here. And since this is a Confirmatory Factor Analysis, the validity of the study and results would depend on the theoretical ground that is provided for the factors.

In "validity" section, above table 2 authors claim that "Fitting of one- and two-factor structure of the scale was assessed. The fit indices of both structures confirmed the seven-factor model". How is it possible? Can you explain it more?

In “discussion” the authors discuss that one-factor solution is consistent with the U.S. study and refer to citation number 7; and then add that the two-factor solution is consistent with the original study and again refer to citation number 7. And there is no mention of the 7-factor model throughout the discussion. Also citations number 7 and 14 seem to be identical.

In line 228, “Divergent validity was assessed by RSES”, I think should be corrected and replaced by “convergent”.
Overall, this is a valuable work that studied an important and essential measure. I recommend the authors to clarify the ambiguities in their report and justify the contradictions between their model and the original paper, and revise the manuscript according to the reviewers’ comments.

Kind regards,
AE

**Mehran Zarghami**: EIC | **Revision (0)** 24 Feb 2022

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.

# reply to reviewer

### reviewer 1

1- The tools normative necessity mentioned in background.
2- *fit indicators mentioned in abstract.*
3- *Scale 6 was corrected.*
4- The result was summarized in abstract.
5- The importance of clinical is mentioned in conclusion part.
6- *inclusion and exclusion criteria and ethical consideration was mentioned.*
7- This is the first evolutionary tools in this field.
8- *the need to standardize scales mentioned.*
9- The words changed to population.
10- *criterion for choosing the self-esteem scale and Dass was mentioned.*
11- More description about the tool was added.
12- *Subscales summarized.*
13- Method was completed.
14- Tables modified.
15- *main study indicators were mentioned in discussion part.*
16- References were corrected.
17- *Conflicts of interest and acknowledgments mentioned at the end of the article.*
18- *convergent and divergent validity was explained.*
19- The suggestion was mentioned.
20- Limitation was mentioned.
21- The name of constructer was mentioned.

### reviewer 2

**1-** the grammatical point was corrected.
**2-** The word condition was replaced.
**3-** This scale is used usually to boost CBT therapy and that's why which is focused on CBT.
**4-** this is the first scale to using evolutionary concept in CBT.
**5-** University student was replaced with medical students.
**6-** the limitation was explained more clearly.

### Reply to associate editor

1- references were corrected.
2- divergent validity was replaced.
3- Factors were corrected.

**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.

¬ **Somayeh Zamirinejad**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (**1**) 9 Mar 2022

Dear EIC,

Unfortunately this revision fails to address the main concern about the theoretical and statistical ground for the claimed factors, and throughout the whole manuscript there are several contradictions that convey a general confusion about the factor structure of the scale. Here I mention some examples to show what I mean:

Line 16 -> The CFA results demonstrated the seven factor model …

Line 95 -> this scale includes six subscales …; then in the following paragraphs 7 subscales has been described.

Line 156 -> … the seven factor model

Line 196 -> Fitting of seven factor structure

Lines 197 &198 -> Table 2 presents results of fit indices of the two models. The fit indices of both structures confirmed the seven-factor model.
While Table 2 has one row.

Lines 219 & 220 -> the results showed the one-factor structure of the evolutionary fitness scale

Line 224 -> Results of our study confirmed the two-factor structure of the scale

The original paper indicates that the items loaded on 2 factors: “personal adaptedness” items 1-37 and “partner and offspring fitness” items 38-58. There was no mention of the 7 subscales that is mentioned here.

Notabene when translating a measure to the second language, you need to do CFA only. If you get a satisfactory indices, then this is enough for you to keep the same scoring method of the original scale. However, if the CFA did not support the original structure, then you need to do EFA, and reach a new structure for the scale.

If the authors are insistent on the 7-factor model, which is not based on the original paper, I suggest re-analyzing the data based on the factor structure of the original article and if the data did not support that structure, run an EFA. In the next revision, include the factor loadings table to your report, and they have to upload the Persian translation of the scale and the original article of the scale, along with the new revision files.

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 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.

# reply to reviewer

### reviewer 1

1- The tools normative necessity mentioned in background.
2- *fit indicators mentioned in abstract.*
3- *Scale 6 was corrected.*
4- The result was summarized in abstract.
5- The importance of clinical is mentioned in conclusion part.
6- *inclusion and exclusion criteria and ethical consideration was mentioned.*
7- This is the first evolutionary tools in this field.
8- *the need to standardize scales mentioned.*
9- The words changed to population.
10- *criterion for choosing the self-esteem scale and Dass was mentioned.*
11- More description about the tool was added.
12- *Subscales summarized.*
13- Method was completed.
14- Tables modified.
15- *main study indicators were mentioned in discussion part.*
16- References were corrected.
17- *Conflicts of interest and acknowledgments mentioned at the end of the article.*
18- *convergent and divergent validity was explained.*
19- The suggestion was mentioned.
20- Limitation was mentioned.
21- The name of constructer was mentioned.

### reviewer 2

**1-** the grammatical point was corrected.
**2-** The word condition was replaced.
**3-** This scale is used usually to boost CBT therapy and that's why which is focused on CBT.
**4-** this is the first scale to using evolutionary concept in CBT.
**5-** University student was replaced with medical students.
**6-** the limitation was explained more clearly.

### Reply to associate editor

1- references were corrected.
2- divergent validity was replaced.
3- The data were re analyzed by two factor model.

**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.

**Somayeh Zamirinejad**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 19 Apr 2022

Dear EIC,

I would like to thank the authors for revising and resubmitting the manuscript to the IJPBS. The authors have reanalyzed the data according to the factor structure of the original study and made necessary changes in the manuscript. The title of table 1 needs to rewritten in the form of a title (it's a sentence now).

Kind regards,
AE

**Mehran Zarghami**: EIC | **Revision** (2) 7 May 2022

Dear Authors,

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

Kind regards,
EIC