IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Volume 19 · Issue 1 · e136085

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Psychometric Properties of Persian Version of Benign and Malicious Envy Scale (BeMaS) in Iranian Adults

Jaber Alizadehgoradel, Zekrollah Morovati, Mina Taherifard

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
5 Mar 2023	1 Feb 2025	20 Feb 2025	10.5812/ijpbs-136085

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, Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 5
Authors' reply to reviewers 6
Reviewer and editor comments 10
3 **Revision 2** Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 11
Authors' reply to reviewers 12
Reviewer and editor comments 13

1 Original submission

4 comments · 15 Oct 2024 – 5 Dec 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 15 Oct 2024

Dear Authors
Many thanks. There are 7 comments you need to consider:
1-The objectives of your study are vague. Please use methodological terms and organize the results in accordance with them.
2-In the abstract, report the results precisely; add other fit indices. An r=0.35 indicates a moderate relationship.
3- In the method section, explain the statistical analysis.
4-It's better to spell out the abbreviations for the fit indices in the Results section.
5- Please examine the test-retest reliability in your study.
6- In the Discussion section, refer to more studies that are consistent with your work, particularly new ones.
7-I advise authors to get their work edited and proofread for grammar and punctuation.
Sincerely
Sh. S

Referee 2 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 28 Nov 2024

Title
1- Please replace Characteristics with properties.
Abstract
1- Please mention the time and setting of the study.
2- Report Cronbach's alpha.
3- Verify and update the keywords using MeSH terms from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh.

Introduction
1- In the introduction, you need to provide more background. When was it developed? Who is the developer, and what was its origin? Why was it developed? What are the positive points, and what are the drawbacks?
2- Please explain the history of the development of this scale.
method
1- Precisely describe the method: how were the participants selected, how did you contact them, and was there a written consent form? How did you send them the questionnaires?
2- Mention the inclusion and exclusion criteria.
3- Please refer to the validity and reliability of all measures in Iran.
4- The ethics committee approval code should be mentioned.
5- The procedures of your study were unclear.
6- Please explain more about the statistical analysis in the method section.

Result
1- McDonald's omega is based on a factor analytic approach, in contrast to alpha, which is primarily based on the correlation between the questions. Omega has proven to be more robust than alpha against deviations, and will thus generally be a more suitable measure of internal consistency. Please report McDonald's omega. Report Cronbach's alpha and McDonald's omega.

2- Please report convergent and discriminant validity.
3- The assumptions of the analysis should be mentioned.

Discussion
1- Please mention possible explanations for the consistency and inconsistency between your study results and those of other studies.
2-
3- Explain the strengths of the study in comparison with previous reports in the discussion section.
4- Please compare the results of your research with previous research and be sure to explain the results.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 28 Nov 2024

Reviewer 1
Dear Authors
Many thanks. There are 7 comments you need to consider:
1-The objectives of your study are vague. Please use methodological terms and organize the Result section accordingly.
2-In the abstract, write the results precisely; add other fit indexes. r=0.35 indicates a moderate relationship.
3- In the method section, explain the statistical analysis.
4-It's better to spell out the abbreviations for the fit indexes in the Results section.
5- Please examine the test-retest reliability in your study.
6- In the Discussion section, refer to more studies that are consistent with your work, particularly newer ones.
7-I advise the authors to get their work edited and proofread for grammar and punctuation.
Sincerely

Reviewer 2
Please include the following in the introduction:
Necessity of the study
Relationship between dimensions of jealousy and psychopathology
For all the tools used, mention the alpha coefficient in your study.
Reviewer 3
Title
1- Please replace Characteristics with properties.
Abstract
1- Please mention the time and setting of the study.
2- Report Cronbach's alpha.
3- Verify and update the keywords using MeSH terms from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh.

Introduction
1- In the introduction, you need to provide more background. When was it developed? Who is the developer, and what was its origin? Why was it developed? What are its positive points and drawbacks?
2- Please explain the history of the development of this scale.
method
1- Precisely describe the method: How were the participants selected? How did you contact them? Was there a written consent form? How did you send them the questionnaires?
2- Mention the inclusion and exclusion criteria.
3- Please refer to the validity and reliability of all measures in Iran.
4- The ethics committee approval code should be mentioned.

5- The procedures of your study were unclear.
6- Please explain more about the statistical analysis in the method section.

Result
1- McDonald's omega is based on a factor analytic approach, in contrast to alpha, which is primarily based on the correlation between the questions. Omega has proven to be more robust than alpha against deviations and will thus generally be a more suitable measure of internal consistency. Please report McDonald's omega. Report Cronbach's alpha and McDonald's omega.
2- Please report convergent and discriminant validity.
3- The assumptions of the analysis should be mentioned.

Discussion
1- Please mention possible explanations for the consistency and inconsistency between your study results and those of other studies.
2-
3- Explain the strengths of the study in comparison with previous reports in the discussion section.
4- Please compare the results of your research with previous research and be sure to explain the results.

Editor-in-Chief MAJOR REVISION 5 Dec 2024

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 revise your manuscript according to the reviewers' comments.

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 provided at 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. Revised text must be highlighted in the full manuscript file.

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:

Reviewer 1:

I would like to express my sincere gratitude for your valuable comments and feedback. I have made the necessary changes to the manuscript based on your suggestions, and I hope these revisions enhance the quality of the paper.

Title
1- Please replaced Characteristics with properties

Thank you for your suggestion. We have replaced “Characteristics” with “Properties” in the title of the manuscript as recommended.

Abstract
1- Please mention time and setting of study

Thank you for your valuable feedback. Revised.

2- Report cronbach's alpha

Thank you for your suggestion. Added.

3- Verify and update the keywords using MeSH terms from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh.

Thank you for your suggestion. Added.

Introduction
1-) In the introduction part, you need to introduce more. When did it develop? Who is the developer, what was the origin? Why it is developed? what are the positive points and what are the drawbacks?

Thank you for your suggestion. Added.

2- please explain the history of developing this scale

Thank you for your suggestion. Added.

method
1- Precisely describe the method: how the participants were selected, how you contacted them, was there a written consent form? How you sent them the questionnaires?
2- mention include and exclude criteria
3- Please refer to the validity and reliability of all measures in Iran.
4- Ethical committee approval code should be mentioned
5- Procedures of your study was unclear
6- Please explain more about statistical analysis in the method section

Thank you for your suggestion. Added.

Result
1- McDonald's omega is based on a factor analytic approach, in contrast to alpha, which is primarily based on the correlation between the questions. Omega has proven to be more robust than alpha against deviations, and will thus generally be a more suitable measure of internal consistency. Please report McDonald's omega. Report cronbach's alpha and McDonald's Omega.

Added

2- Please report convergent and discriminant validity

It is mentioned in the section on Construct Validity

3- Presumptions of analysis should be mention

Thank you for your suggestion. Added.

Discussion
1- Please mention possible explanations of consistency and inconsistency in your study results with the studies of others.
2-
3- Explain about strength points of the study in comparison with previous reports in discussion section.
4- Please compare the results of your research with previous research and be sure to explain the results

Thank you for your valuable comment. Added.

Reviewer 2:

I would like to express my sincere gratitude for your valuable comments and feedback. I have made the necessary changes to the manuscript based on your suggestions, and I hope these revisions enhance the quality of the paper.

Please include the following in the introduction:

Necessity of study

Thank you for your valuable comment. Added.

Relationship between dimensions of jealousy and psychopathology

Added
In all the tools used, mention the alpha coefficient in your study.

Added

Reviewer 3:
Dear Authors

I would like to express my sincere gratitude for your valuable comments and feedback. I have made the necessary changes to the manuscript based on your suggestions, and I hope these revisions enhance the quality of the paper.

Many thanks. there are 7 comments you need to consider:

1-The objectives of your study are vague, please use the methodological terms, and organize the Result appropriate with them.

Thank you for your valuable comment. Added.

2-In the abstract, write the result precisely; add other fit indexes and r=0.35 is a moderate relationship.

Added.

3- In the method section, explain statistical analysis .

Added
4-It's better to elaborate the abbreviation of Fit Indexes in the Results section.

Added
5- Please examine the test- retest reliability in your study.

The questionnaire developer has previously conducted a test-retest reliability assessment, and our objective is confirmatory factor analysis (CFA).

6- In Discussion section, reference to more studies that is consistent with your work, particularly new one.

Added
7-I advise authors to get their work edited and proofread for grammar and punctuation.

proofread

2 Revision 1

4 comments · 3 Jan 2025 – 29 Jan 2025

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 3 Jan 2025

Dear Authors,
Many thanks. You have addressed the comments, which has made your manuscript valuable and acceptable, but it still needs to be edited:
1-Please add the “p-value” of Confirmatory Factor Analysis in the Result and Abstract sections.
2- A correlation value of 0.18 is very weak at the correlation level. It is better not to report it or to report it with a correlation level.
3- There are a lot of mistakes in your manuscript; I advise the authors to get their work edited and proofread for grammar and punctuation.

Sincerely,
Sh. S

Referee 2 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 29 Jan 2025

The manuscript is written in poor English and needs to be edited.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 29 Jan 2025

Dear Authors
Many thanks. You have addressed the comments, which has made your manuscript valuable and acceptable, but it still needs to be edited:
1-Please add the “p-value” of Confirmatory Factor Analysis in the Result and Abstract sections.
2- A correlation value of 0.18 is very weak at the correlation level. It is better not to report it or to report it with a correlation level.
3- There are a lot of mistakes in your manuscript; I advise the authors to get their work edited and proofread for grammar and punctuation.
The manuscript is written in poor English and needs to be edited.

Sincerely,

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 29 Jan 2025

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. I would appreciate it if you could make the revisions as soon as possible. Revised text must be highlighted throughout the full manuscript file.

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

Reviewer 1:
Dear Authors
Many thanks. You have done the comments, which made your manuscript valuable and acceptable, but it still needs to be edited:
1-Please add the "p-value" of Confirmatory Factor Analysis in the Result and Abstract sections.

Thank you for your suggestion. We are pleased to inform you that the "p-value" of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis has been added to both the Abstract and Results sections. This information will enhance the clarity and validity of our findings.

2- A correlation value of 0.18 is very weak at the correlation level. It is better not to report it or to report it with a correlation level.

Thank you for your comment. We have conducted the analysis again, and while the correlation value of 0.18 is indeed low, it is statistically significant due to the sample size. We believe it is important to report this finding, as even weak correlations can provide valuable insights in the context of our study. If you have any further suggestions or questions, we would be happy to discuss them.

3- There are a lot of mistakes in your manuscript, I advise authors to get their work edited and proofread for grammar and punctuation.

Thank you for your feedback. We appreciate your suggestions and have thoroughly reviewed the manuscript.

3 Revision 2

3 comments · 14 Feb 2025 – 20 Feb 2025

Referee 2 Reviewer — ACCEPT 14 Feb 2025

accept

Associate Editor — ACCEPT 14 Feb 2025

Thanks.

Editor-in-Chief — ACCEPT 20 Feb 2025

We have completed our review of your manuscript and are pleased to inform you that it is being considered for publication in the Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences. 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 Progress in Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.