IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Volume 18 · Issue 3 · e132901

OPEN PEER REVIEW

The Persian Version of the Perfectionistic Self-Presentation Scale: Psychometric Properties

Shirzad Babaei, Masoumeh Barani, Sajad Khanjani, Ahmad Ashouri

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
5 Nov 2022	24 Dec 2023	30 May 2024	10.5812/ijpbs-132901

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** Lida Hosseini, Referee 1, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 7

1 Original submission

3 comments · 7 Apr 2023 – 6 Sep 2023

Lida Hosseini Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 7 Apr 2023

Thank you for inviting me to review the manuscript entitled "The Persian Version of Perfectionistic Self-presentation Scale: Psychometric Properties in an Adults Non-Clinical Sample". It has major problems, some of which I will mention below. I hope that by addressing them, the work can be improved.
1) The research gap and its importance have not been mentioned, and the text needs to be rewritten to address them.
2) In the introduction, you introduced several scales used to assess perfectionism. What are the differences between them? Why did you choose the PSPS?
3) In the introduction, you should introduce the chosen scale fully.
4) The participants in this study were from the general population. If so, what was your reason for choosing them?
5) The target population is not clear. It has been described using different terms, such as "Adults Non-Clinical Sample, Iranian adults, Iranian students". It should be described consistently throughout the manuscript.
6) In general, the inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants are not clear or complete.
7) Did you get permission from the scale developer? You should state this in the text.
8) The information about face validity is not clear. Rewrite it.
9) The indices of qualitative content validity are incorrect: "observing grammar, using the appropriate words, proper item placement, and scoring appropriately". Also, on what basis was the minimum acceptable numerical value for CVR chosen? Simplicity, specificity, and clarity were assessed in face validity, not content validity. Overall, the descriptions of face and content validity should be carefully rewritten.
10) What do you mean by the sentence "We used the STROBE cross-sectional reporting guidelines" without any explanation?
11) Have you not checked the univariate distribution and outliers?
12) What were the demographic characteristics of the participants? You should report them in one table.
13) In the measures section, you should introduce the original scale and its validity based on the original and previous studies.
14) The information presented in tables two and Three is very incomplete and should be fundamentally revised.
15) The discussion section is very brief and unsystematic. The items and their suitability for the culture of the study population should be discussed. In addition, the results of this study should be discussed in relation to those of other studies that have psychometrically evaluated this instrument in other countries.
16) There is no conclusion section.
17) There are many typographical and linguistic problems, and the manuscript needs serious revision.
18) The method of referencing needs to be seriously reconsidered.

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 5 Sep 2023

Dear editor of the Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
First of all, I would like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to study "The Persian Version of Perfectionistic Self-presentation Scale: Psychometric Properties in an Adults Non-Clinical Sample". Some points that may improve the quality of the article are written below.
1- There are several problems with the writing of this article. For example, the abstract states that

confirmatory factor analysis has been performed. The software used is SPSS. This is not true.
2- When we use confirmatory factor analysis, construct reliability should be reported, not Cronbach's alpha coefficient.
3- It is wrong to write the number like this: 0/94. This notation means that zero is divided by 94!
4- The conclusion reported in the abstract is incorrect. Based on which report is it concluded that the instrument has sufficient validity?
5- The tables are drawn very inappropriately, and there is not enough information in them.
6- The numbers reported as indicators of model fit are questionable. I don't think the numbers are correct. Also, the model's degrees of freedom are not specified.
7- The structural model diagram has not been drawn and reported.
8- Why was exploratory factor analysis not done?
9- What method is used to estimate the confirmatory factor analysis model?
10- How are the normal distribution and outliers of the data evaluated?
11- Based on the reported model fit, the index CMIN/DF shows that the model is not fitted.
12- Therefore, the results are not valid and defensible.

Editor-in-Chief MAJOR REVISION 6 Sep 2023

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.

After revision, authors are obliged to upload a Word file containing the reviewers' comments and their replies 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 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.

> Reviewers' Comments and Responses:

Reviewer 1:
Thank you for inviting me to review the manuscript entitled "The Persian Version of Perfectionistic Self-presentation Scale: Psychometric Properties in an Adults Non-Clinical Sample". It has major problems, some of which I will mention below. I hope that by reforming them, the work can be improved.
1) The gap study and its importance have been not mentioned and they need to be rewritten.
R: In the introduction section of the article, revision text and necessary content were added
2) In the introduction part, you introduced the several scales that use for assessing Perfectionistic. Which differences are between them? Why you chose the PSPS?
R: In the introduction section of the article, revision text and necessary content were added.
3) In the introduction, you should introduce the chosen scale completely.
R: In the introduction section of the article, revision text and necessary content were added.
4) The samples of this study were the general population. If it is, what is your reason for choosing them?
R: In the sample section of the article, the text was revised
5) Target population is not clear. They have been introduced by different names such as "Adults Non-Clinical Sample, Iranian adults, Iranian students". It should be written the same in the whole manuscript.
R: The target population of the article was reviewed and revised in the entire text of the article
6) In general, the inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants are not clear and complete.
R: Added in the method section of the article.
7) Did you get permission from the scale developer? You should state it in the text.
R: It is stated in the final part of the article in the ethical statement section.
8) The information about face validity is not clear. Rewrite it.
R. it was rewritten.
9) The indexes of qualitative content validity are not true "observing grammar, using the appropriate words, proper item placement, and scoring appropriately". As well as the Minimum acceptable numerical value for CVR on what basis was it chosen? The simplicity, specificity, and clarity were assessed in face validity, not content validity. Totally, the face and content validity should be written again carefully.
R. it was corrected and mentioned.
10) What is your mean by the sentence "We used the STROBE cross-sectional reporting guidelines" without any explanation?
R. it was deleted.
11) Have you not checked the univariate distribution and outlier?
R. it was mentioned in data analyzing section.
12) What were the demographic characteristics of the participants? You should report them in one table.
R. in the table 1 were brought.
13) In the part of the measure, you should introduce the original scale and its validity based on original and previous studies.
R: Necessary changes were made.
14) The information mentioned in tables two and Three are very incomplete and should be fundamentally revised.
R. were corrected
15) The discussion part has been written very briefly and unprincipled. It should be discussed about the items and their suitability with the culture of the study population. In addition, the results of this study should be discussed with other studies that have psychometrically evaluated this instrument in other countries.

R: The discussion section of the article was revised and the content increase was considered.
16) There is no conclusion part.
R: Added conclusion section.
17) There are many typographical and linguistic problems and it needs serious revision.
R: The text was revised
18) The method of referencing needs to be seriously reconsidered.
R: Necessary corrections were made
Reviewer 2:
Dear editor of the Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
First of all, I would like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to study "The Persian Version of Perfectionistic Self-presentation Scale: Psychometric Properties in an Adults Non-Clinical Sample". Some points that may improve the quality of the article are written below.
1- There are several problems in writing this article. For example, it is written in the abstract that confirmatory factor analysis has been performed. The software used is SPSS. This is not true
R. In the abstract method, LISREL software was brought.
2- When we use confirmatory factor analysis, construct reliability should be reported, not Cronbach's alpha coefficient.
R. in Data analysis section, it was corrected.
3- It is wrong to write the addition like this: 0/94. The meaning of this form of writing is that zero is divided by 94!
R. it was corrected.
4- The conclusion reported in the abstract is incorrect. Based on which report it is concluded that the instrument has sufficient validity?
R. it was corrected.
5- The tables are drawn very inappropriately and there is not enough information in them
R. the tables were corrected.
6- The results of the numbers reported as indicators of fitness are questionable. I don't think the numbers are correct. Also, the degree of freedom of the model is not specified
R. The reported numbers were reviewed again and corrected. DF reported.
7- The diagram of the structure model has not been drawn and reported.
R. Model diagram was brought.
8- Why is exploratory factor analysis not done?
R. Considering that factor structure of this questionnaire has been investigated in the original article and other cultures mentioned in the text of the article, therefore, it is possible to investigate the confirmatory factor structure of a tool in the new culture without examining exploratory factor structure.
9- What method is used to estimate the confirmatory factor analysis model?
*R. in data analyzing was brought (*using maximum likelihood)
10- How is the normal distribution and outliers of the data evaluated?
R. in Data analyzing was mentioned
11- Based on the reported model fit, the index CMIN/DF shows that the model is not fitted.
R. The reasons are mentioned in the results section, and given the desirable other indicators, this finding can be negligible.
12- Therefore, the results are not valid and defensible
R. The range of suitability of fitting indices along with reliable references is indicated in explaining the results of the fit of the model, which can be said that the tool has a good fit.

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 30 May 2024 – 30 May 2024

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 30 May 2024

Thank you very much for revising the manuscript. I think the necessary revisions have been made and the manuscript can be published in IJPBS.

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 30 May 2024

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 with your cooperation in 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.