IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Volume 16 · Issue 4 · e123340

OPEN PEER REVIEW

# Psychometric Properties of the Persian Version of the 47-item Mobility Questionnaire in Children with Cerebral Palsy

Mansour Noori, Nazila Akbarfahimi, Seyed Ali Hosseini, Mohsen Vahedi

| SUBMITTED | REVISED | ACCEPTED | DOI |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 19 Feb 2022 | 20 Jul 2022 | 7 Dec 2022 | 10.5812/ijpbs-123340 |

## 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** Editor-in-Chief ..... 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Editor-in-Chief ..... 3
**Authors' reply to reviewers** ..... 4
**Reviewer and editor comments** ..... 8
3 **Revision 2** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief ..... 9
**Authors' reply to reviewers** ..... 10
**Reviewer and editor comments** ..... 11

## 1 Original submission

1 comment · 21 May 2022

### Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 21 May 2022

Thank you for submitting your manuscript for consideration for publication in the Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences. 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 complete the revisions as soon as possible.

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 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. The full manuscript file must be highlighted to indicate the revised text.

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.

**Reply to Reviewers**

**Hello and thanks for your valuable comments that obviously enriched our study. All the applied changes are highlighted in the text and are brought here in the table:**

| **Reviewer 1:** | **Answer** |
|---|---|
| 1- In introduction: 'Children with the maximum motor independence are considered in level 1 and those with the minimum dependency are assigned to level 5'- it means the same! Please recheck it. | **1- It is corrected to "Children with the maximum motor independence are considered in level 1 and those with the minimum independency are assigned to level 5"** |
| 2- Please explain how the parents completed the test in the second point. Did you email it or read it through a phone call? | **2- Corrected to: "The questionnaire was in paper format and in both rounds of assessment. The questionnaires were given to the parents in the clinic, as they were routine clients in the six clinics that the samples emerged from."** |
| 3- Add the academic degree and experience of the nine experts. Why didn't you have other professionals in the expert group such as neurologists? | **3-** Is corrected to (6 with a Ph.D. and 3 with a master's in occupational therapy, and at least 10 years of experience)<br>**Because occupational therapists are the main specialist that has exact information and insight for mobility in children, in the research committee it was agreed that an expert panel is better to be from OTs.** |
| 4- 'Scores were interpreted as fair (0.40–0.59), good (0.60–0.75), and excellent (_0.75)' – it should be >=75 | 4- Thanks, corrected. |
| 5- One suggestion could be administering factor analysis since it makes it possible to find out the related factors of the instrument and comparing it in a more reliable way with other ways of evaluation | 5- The factor analysis is added now. |
| Reviewer 2: | |
| This a good manuscript, but I have some comments.<br>1- In the first line of abstract, it is better to say that CP is common in children not highly common…. | **1-** We omitted the "highly" word. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 2- In the procedure part:<br>Do not begin the sentence with a number.<br><br>3- You wrote, “After four weeks, the Persian version of the mobility questionnaire was completed again by the parents of all 200 children. The results of both pretest and post-test stages were recorded.” You did not have any intervention, thus it is better to write “between the first and second time…<br><br>4- on the other hand, in the Reliability part you mentioned that “30 parents answered the MobQ after one week, again”. Which one is correct, the parents of all 200 children” or “30 parents”?<br><br>5- There is not clear that what is the ICC or Cronbach's alpha coefficient in your study. Your wording is vague. Please see the attached file. | **2-** The sentences are all reviewed and no sentence is started with a number now.<br><br>**3-** The sentence corrected to: “The gained scores in the first and second assessments were then”<br><br>**4-** The sentence is corrected to:” The number of participants was 202 caregivers for measuring factor analysis, convergent validity, and internal consistency, and 30 participants for reliability part.”<br>**5-** We corrected to: “The ICC in this study was 0.998, with a 95% confidence interval, thus indicating the questionnaire's appropriate reliability. Scores were interpreted as fair (0.40–0.59), good (0.60–0.75), and excellent (>0.75)(17) . Also, Cronbach's alpha coefficient in this study was 0.996, thus showing that the questionnaire had high internal consistency.” |
| Reviewer 3: | |
| This is a new and practical article. I agree with its publication. | **Thank you so much!** |
| Reviewer 4:<br><br>Title:<br>1- delete " in 6-12-year-old "<br>2- Psychometric issues !!! properties<br><br>Abstract<br>3- " to determine the content validity, the content validity index (CVI) and the content validity ratio (CVR) were used; on the other hand, to measure absolute and relative reliability, the standard error of measurement index (SEM) and intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) were utilized, respectively. For this purpose, the opinions of 9 occupational therapists active in the field of children with cerebral palsy were considered. Internal consistency was described by calculating Cronbach's alpha. The test-retest reliability was | **1 and 2:** corrected “Psychometric properties of the Persian version of the 47-item mobility questionnaire in children with cerebral palsy”<br><br>**3-**This correction is made: “In this psychometric study 202 participants (84 girls and 118 boys, with a mean age of 95.92 months ±23.73), 15 parents, and nine occupational therapists participated. a multistage sampling method was used. The content, construct, convergent and face validity were estimated. internal validity and test-retest reliability were studied, too. The convergent validity of |

| | |
|---|---|
| then obtained by calculating the ICC and evaluating the convergent validity according to the gross motor functions classification scale (GMFCS) "this paragraph is not necessary, please summarize that. Instead write some other important things in method section<br>4- In the Abstract please mention the year and cite of study<br>5- In the Abstract please mention the scales of study,<br>6- Sampling method<br>7- Keywords should be according to MeSH and alphabets<br>Introduction<br><br>8- Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation<br>9- In Introduction, Paragraphs were not appropriate organized<br><br>Method<br>10- Please download similar published articles in our journal and write the manuscript according to that format. Method section of the manuscript wrote in a poor manner. Needs rewriting.<br>11- Summarize tools section and report important things. Item?<br><br>Results<br>12- Table 2: Participants' characteristics should be first table<br>13- Calculate sensitivity and spiffily and cut off point<br>14- Run factor analyses<br>15- … | MobQ was studied according to the gross motor functions classification scale (GMFCS).)."<br><br>4-In the abstract: "age in Tehran, Iran September 2019."<br>5-is corrected<br>6-is mentioned now<br>7-corrected to" Cerebral Palsy, locomotion, occupational therapy, psychometrics, validity and reliability"<br>8- some sentences are highlieghted to gain your attention at rationals and objectives are added:" The validity and reliability of the mobility have been assessed in various categories of children with cerebral palsy. In this study, we prospectively studied the internal consistency, factor analysis, and convergent validity of the Persian version of mobility in children with cerebral palsy as well as the reliability of the 47-item Mobility Questionnaire."<br><br>10-It is re-written<br><br>11- it is changed and highlighted (too large for pasting here)<br><br>12- Is corrected now<br>13- Is brought in results<br>14- Is added and highlighted |

| | |
|---|---|
| Discussion<br>16- In discussion: Relate the explanations provided to the points you mentioned in the introduction.<br>17- In discussion: Compare your new findings with the findings of others previous studies.<br>18- In discussion: Mention possible explanations for consistency and inconsistency results of your studies with others previous studies<br>19- Discuss the generalizability (external validity) of the study results | 16, 17 please check the highlighted sentences |
| Comments in the word file | |
| The fonts should be made uniform.<br><br>Font uniformity should be observed.<br><br>The Introduction is well structured. In my opinion, it does not need to be changed. If the other reviewers request changes, make them.<br><br>The ethics code should be given at the end of the Methods.<br>Were the questionnaires completed at the clinic? | **Thanks! All is done!** |
| Don’t begin the sentence with a number<br><br>You didn’t have any intervention, thus it is better to write “between the first and second time…”<br>Is this reference related to this sentence?<br><br>Is this the ICC that obtained in your study?<br><br>Is this the Cronbach's alpha coefficient that obtained in your study? | **Thanks! All is done and highlighted** |
| | |

*[Translated from Persian by the Brieflands editorial office.]*

## 2 Revision 1

2 comments · 15 Jul 2022 – 18 Jul 2022

### Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 15 Jul 2022

Some of the peer review comments have been missed and have not been addressed in the manuscript… To prevent prolongation of the peer-review process, please edit the manuscript according to all of these comments.
1- Replace Psychometric issues with Psychometric properties in all of the text.
2- In the Introduction, the paragraphs were not appropriately organized.
3- " 47 questions were answered within 20-25 minutes. " Don't begin the sentence with a number.
4- " The results of both pretest and post-test stages were recorded " You didn't have any intervention; thus, it is better to write "between the first and second time…"

### Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 18 Jul 2022

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.

**Reply to Reviewers**

**Hello and thanks for your valuable comments that obviously enriched our study. All the applied changes are highlighted in the text and are brought here in the table:**

| Reviewer | Answer |
| --- | --- |
| *1- Replace Psychometric issues with Psychometric properties in all of the text*<br>*2- In the Introduction, the Paragraphs were not appropriate organized*<br>*3- " 47 questions were answered within 20-25 minutes. " Don't begin the sentence with a number*<br>*4- " The results of both pretest and post-test stages were recorded " You didn't have any intervention, thus it is better to write "between the first and second time…"*<br>*5- Participants section should be written in one paragraph. this section should be integrated* | 1- All is corrected and replaced and highlighted<br>2- One paragraph is separated<br>3- It is revised and highlighted<br>4- It is edited and highlighted<br>5- It is changed and highlighted |

## 3 Revision 2

3 comments · 28 Oct 2022 – 12 Nov 2022

**Referee 1** Reviewer — ACCEPT 28 Oct 2022

accept

**Associate Editor** — ACCEPT 28 Oct 2022

accept

**Editor-in-Chief** — 12 Nov 2022

*No public comment.*