IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Volume 18 · Issue 4 · e143833

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Clinical Utility and Diagnostic Validity of the Hierarchical Taxonomy of Psychopathology for Borderline Personality Disorder

Maryam Kami, Abbas Pourshahbaz, Omid Rezaei, Amir Abbas Keshavarz Akhlaghi, Seyedshahab Banihashem, Zahra Dehghanizadeh, Marzie Olamie Koopaie, Masoud Nosratabadi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
10 Dec 2023	8 Oct 2024	19 Oct 2024	10.5812/ijpbs-143833

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, Referee 3, Referee 4, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2

2 **Revision 1** Referee 3, Referee 4, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 5

Authors' reply to reviewers 6

Reviewer and editor comments 14

3 **Revision 2** Referee 4, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 15

Authors' reply to reviewers 16

Reviewer and editor comments 17

1 Original submission

6 comments · 22 Dec 2023 – 7 Mar 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 22 Dec 2023

In the introduction, it is better to summarize the explanations related to HiTop and explain the role of this classification system in diagnosis and treatment.
In the section related to tools, the reliability of each questionnaire in the present study should be mentioned.

Referee 2 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 5 Jan 2024

Dear Authors
Thanks for your study. You called attention to a novel subject that can be valuable in developing a dimensional alternative to traditional nosologies and can also benefit clinical practice. There are some comments you need to consider, which are listed below:
Comment1: Please write the keywords in alphabetical order.
Comment 2: In the sociodemographic characteristics, explain your reason for including the alcohol and/or substance abuse variable.
Comment3: In the method, indicate the Cronbach's alpha of the measurements in your study.
Comment4: In Table2, you indicated PAI-BO, but in the description of the table, you wrote only PID-5; also, descriptive statistics are presented for 3 groups, but you wrote only BPD&Non-BPD.
Comment 5: In Table 2, for the reader to better understand, write the domain and facet in a different order.
Comment6: Please address in your discussion the effect of age on attempted high-risk behaviors in the clinical sample, because life span can be an important factor in moderating personality traits.
Comment7: In the discussion, report the strength of your study.

Referee 3 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 22 Jan 2024

Reinforce the introduction with strong, well-documented justifications for conducting the research.
What is the necessity of your study in the affected group?
Did your study sample need such a review clinically? Please explain.
Modify the study method according to similar published studies.
Begin the results section with a summary of descriptive findings.
The discussion is a bit unrelated; write more coherently.
List actual limitations and suggestions based on your results.
Include the DOI for each reference.
Check the references again and make sure of the authenticity of the sources.
Add newer resources.
The article is written in very superficial language.

Referee 4 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 2 Mar 2024

Write keywords according to MeSH.
General English editing is required.

Introduction
1- The empirical background of the research has not been addressed; previous studies should be briefly and critically reviewed.
Method
2- Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias.

Results
1- Mention the demographic characteristics table in the results section.
Discussion
1. Relate the explanations provided to the points you mentioned in the introduction.
2. Compare your new findings with the findings of other previous studies.
3. Mention possible explanations for consistencies and inconsistencies between the results of your studies and those of other previous studies.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 2 Mar 2024

Reviewer 1

Reinforce the introduction with strong, well-documented justifications for conducting the research.
What is the necessity of your study in the affected group?
Did your study sample need such a review clinically? Please explain.
Modify the study method according to similar published studies.
Begin the results section with a summary of descriptive findings.
The discussion is a bit unrelated; write more coherently.
List actual limitations and suggestions based on your results.
Include the DOI codes in the references.
Check the references again and make sure of the authenticity of the sources.
Add newer resources.
The language of the article is very superficial.

Reviewer 2

Dear Authors
Thanks for your study. You called attention to a novel subject that can be valuable in developing a dimensional alternative to traditional nosologies and can also benefit clinical practice. There are some comments you need to consider, which are below:
Comment1: Please write the keywords in alphabetical order.
Comment 2: In the sociodemographic characteristics, write your reason for including the alcohol and/or substance abuse variable.
Comment3: In the method, indicate Cronbach's alpha for the measurements in your study.
Comment4: In Table2, you indicated PAI-BO, but in the description of the table, you only wrote PID-5; also, the descriptive statistics are presented for 3 groups, but you wrote only BPD&Non-BPD.
Comment 5: In Table 2, for the reader to better understand, write the domain and facet in a different order.
Comment6: Please address in your discussion the effect of age on attempted high-risk behaviors in the clinical sample, because life span can be an important factor in moderating personality traits.
Comment7: In the discussion, report the strength of your study.

Reviewer 3
In the introduction, it is better to summarize the explanations related to HiTop and explain the role of this

classification system in diagnosis and treatment.
In the section related to tools, the reliability of each questionnaire in the present study should be mentioned.

Reviewer 4
Write the keywords according to MeSH.
General English editing is required.
Introduction
1- The empirical background of the research has not been addressed; previous studies should be briefly reviewed critically.
Method
2- Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias.

Results
1- Mention the demographic characteristics table in the results section.
Discussion
1. Relate the explanations provided to the points you mentioned in the introduction.
2. Compare your new findings with the findings of other previous studies.
3. Mention possible explanations for consistency and inconsistency between the results of your studies and those of other previous studies.

Editor-in-Chief MAJOR REVISION 7 Mar 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 make your revisions according to the reviewers' comments.

After revision, authors are obliged to upload a Word file containing the reviewers' comments in which they have replied 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.

Manuscript N0.143833

Response to Reviewers

Dear Dr.Zarghami

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to submit a revised draft of the manuscript *"Clinical Utility and Diagnostic Validity of Hierarchical Taxonomy of Psychopathology for Borderline Personality Disorder"* for publication in the *Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences*. We appreciate the time and effort that you and the reviewers dedicated to providing feedback on our manuscript and are grateful for the insightful comments on and valuable improvements to our paper. We have incorporated most of the suggestions made by the reviewers. Those changes are highlighted within the manuscript. Please see below, in blue, for a point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments and concerns.

Reviewers' Comments to the Authors:

Reviewer 1

Write keyword according to mesh

Author response: As suggested by the reviewer 1, we chose the keywords according to the mesh.

"Borderline Personality Disorder; Clinical Decision-Making; Inpatients; Personality; Personality Assessment"

A general English edition is required

Author response: Thank you for pointing this out. The reviewer1 is right, and we edited all parts of the manuscript.

1- The empirical background of the research has not been addressed; previous researches should be critically reviewed briefly.

Author response: As suggested by the reviewer, we reviewed literature critically in a concise and useful way. We reviewed the HiTOP model roots, necessity of the research, and the similar past research. As the topic is novel, there is not sufficient literature about clinical utility of HiTOP for BPD.

We tried to indicate the other research that investigated HiTOP's clinical utility for other syndromes, and only one study about BPD (P. 4, Lines 85 to 95)

Method

2- Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias

Author response: Thanks for your comment. As the attrition and gender can be the potential sources of bias, we pointed out the attrition in the method section (p. 6, lines 132-133). We also conducted student t-tests to compare the two genders in both clinical and non-clinical samples (P. 9, lines 201-205).

Results

1- Mention demographics characteristic table in result section

Author response: Thank you for the suggestion. We mentioned this table in the result section.

Discussion

1. Relate the explanations provided to the points you mentioned in the introduction.

Author response: In the introduction, we wrote about the HiTOP structure for BPD, and we discussed how much the results were congruent with the hypotheses of

HiTOP in the discussion section (P.11, lines 249-266).

2. Compare your new findings with the findings of others previous studies.

Author response: according to your comment, we discussed the previous studies (p. 11, lines 267-272).

3. Mention possible explanations for consistency and inconsistency results of your studies with others previous studies.

Author response: thanks for your comment. We explained the possible reasons for consistencies/inconsistencies almost on page 11.

Reviewer 2:

Dear Authors

Thanks for your study. You called attention to the novelty subject that can be valuable in developing a dimensional alternative to traditional nosologies and also can benefit clinical practice. There are some comments you need to consider, which are below:

Author response: Thanks for your kindness.

Comment1: Please write the keyword in the alphabet order

Author response: thank you for your comment. We wrote them in the alphabet order.

"Borderline Personality Disorder; Clinical Decision-Making; Inpatients; Personality; Personality Assessment"

Comment 2: In sociodemographic characteristics, write your reason for indicating alcohol and /or substance abuse variable we deleted this.

Author response: thank you for your scrutiny. This study was a part of a thesis project. In addition, we had to assess alcohol and /or substance abuse variables. However, in this study, it was unrelated to the aims of this investigation. Therefore, we removed it from the table.

Comment3: In the method, indicate the Cronbach's alpha of the measurements in your study

Author response: As suggested by the reviewer, we mentioned the Cronbach's alpha for each instrument.

Comment4: In Table2, you indicated PAI-BO, but in the description of the table you just wrote PID-5; also, descriptive statistics is in 3 groups but wrote only BPD&Non-BPD.

Author response: Thank you for pointing this out. The reviewer is right, and we corrected the description of the table.

Comment 5: In Table 2, for the reader to better understand, write the domain and facet in a different order.

Author response: Although they were written in different ways in different articles, we changed the order based on the reviewer's opinion.

Comment6: Please address in your discussion the effect of age on attempted high-risk behaviors in the clinical sample, because life span can be an important factor in moderating personality traits

Author response: We agree with the reviewer's opinion. Accordingly, we have discussed about it throughout the manuscript (p. 12, lines 283-285)

Comment7: In discussion, report the strength of your study

Author response: we mentioned the strength of the study on page 12, lines 307 and 308.

Reviewer 3:

In the introduction, it is better to summarize the explanations related to HiTop and explain the role of this classification system in diagnosis and treatment.

In the section related to tools, the reliability of each questionnaire in the present study should be mentioned.

Author response: thank you for your comment. We tried to summarize the HiTOP related explanations. In addition, we think it was necessary to write about the roots of this new nosology and its empirical evidences. However, according to your valuable comment, we mentioned the role of this model in the diagnosis and treatment section (p. 2 and 3, Lines 68-83).

Reviewer 4:

Reinforce the introduction with strong, well-documented justifications for conducting the research

Author response: Thank you for pointing this out. The reviewer is right, and we strengthened the introduction by explaining the limitations of categorical approaches in the diagnosis of BPD, the attempts for dimensional approaches, the roots of HiTOP as a new quantitative nosology, and the necessity of translating the HiTOP constructs for clinical settings by defining operational criteria based on HiTOP constructs for BPD assessment.

What is the necessity of your study in the affected group?

Author response: In the first paragraph, we explain the limitations of categorical approaches for BPD diagnosis. Ordinarily, we should write more about the challenges in BPD diagnosis, but unfortunately, we exposed the word limitations.

Did your study sample need such a review clinically? Please explain.

Author response: It seems like the reviewer is questioning whether the characteristics of the participants in our study required this clinical evaluation to ensure the validity and reliability of our findings. In response to the reviewer's question regarding the clinical sampling process in our study, it is important to acknowledge the significance of conducting a thorough review of the sample clinically. By carefully evaluating and selecting patients based on specific criteria, we aimed to ensure the validity and reliability of our study findings.

By utilizing structured diagnostic interviews, as well as standardized questionnaires, we aimed to establish a clear diagnosis of BPD and assess the severity of symptoms in our sample.

Furthermore, by excluding patients with medical/psychiatric conditions or medication use affecting consciousness and cognitive abilities, we sought to minimize confounding factors that could impact the study results.

Overall, the detailed clinical sampling process was essential for establishing a rigorous methodology and ensuring the validity of our study results.

Modify the study method according to similar published studies.

Author response: Thank you for your comment. We checked out some of the articles in "IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences." It seems that each article structured the study method in different ways. We checked out the study of Calvo, et al. (2016) and we found the structured study method in this order: participants, measurement, procedures, and data analysis. We tried to explain each detail that was necessary.

Begin the results section with a summary of descriptive findings.

Author response: thank you for the comment. According to the reviewer's opinion, we added a sub-section in the first part of the result section for descriptive findings.

The discussion is a bit unrelated, write more coherently.

Author response: the reviewer is right. We rewrote the discussion section coherently.

List actual limits and suggestions based on your results.

Author response: the limitations of the study were the nature of the sample (inpatients), the use of self-reports for assessing the personality traits, and the absence of a distinct clinical sample to replicate the obtained results. We suggested

that in future researchers will replicate this study in a broader range of samples and other clinical settings including outpatient centers. Finally, we suggest that further research will use the informant form of PID-5 to assess personality traits, specifically antagonism- related traits precisely (p.13, lines 307-318).

Mention the references with the doi code.

Author response: As suggested by the reviewer, we added the DOI codes in the references section.

Check the references again and make sure of the authenticithty of the sources.

Author response: Thank you. We checked them out. Some cases of the references were changed to follow the revised manuscript.

Add newer resources.

Author response: As suggested by the reviewer, we tried to add newer references; although sometimes using the old references was inevitable.

The language of the article is written very superficially

Author response: thanks for your comment. The manuscript was rewritten and revised. In addition, it was edited by a native editor.

References

Calvo, N., Valero, S., Sáez-Francàs, N., Gutiérrez, F., Casas, M., & Ferrer, M. (2016). Borderline Personality Disorder and Personality Inventory for DSM-5 (PID-5): Dimensional personality assessment with DSM-5. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, *70*, 105-111. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comppsych.2016.07.002

2 Revision 1

4 comments · 11 Apr 2024 – 10 Jul 2024

Referee 3 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 11 Apr 2024

1-At the end of the introduction, you stated:
'Given that personality is influenced by cultural factors, the HiTOP consortium has prioritized 96 multicultural perspectives to enhance the model's generalizability". How?
2-State the inclusion criteria more clearly.
3-Exclusion criteria are those that occur during the study. Please correct.
4-You can use the link below to enhance the concepts related to personality.
https://brieflands.com/articles/ijpbs-123720

Referee 4 Reviewer

ACCEPT 6 Jul 2024

accept

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 6 Jul 2024

1-At the end of the introduction, you have said:
"Given that personality is influenced by cultural factors, the HiTOP consortium has prioritized 96 multicultural perspectives to enhance the model's generalizability"—how?
2-State the inclusion criteria more clearly.
3-Exclusion criteria are those that occur during the study. Please correct.
4-You can use the link below to enhance the concepts related to personality.
https://brieflands.com/articles/ijpbs-123720

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 10 Jul 2024

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 using Track Changes in MS Word and colored 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.

Response to Reviewers

Dear Dr.Zarghami

Thank you for your valuable feedback on our manuscript, "Clinical Utility and Diagnostic Validity of Hierarchical Taxonomy of Psychopathology for Borderline Personality Disorder," and for allowing us to submit a revised draft for publication in the Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences. We express our gratitude for the time and effort you and the other reviewers dedicated to providing feedback on our paper.
We have thoroughly considered your comments and incorporated most of the suggestions into the revised manuscript. The changes have been highlighted in green throughout the document, and we have also improved some phrases and sentences in terms of English scientific writing, which are highlighted in yellow. Please refer to the page numbers in the revised manuscript file with the tracked changes for a detailed response to your comments and concerns.
We are grateful for your insightful comments and valuable enhancements to our paper.
Best regards,

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
1-In the end of the introduction you have said:
'Given that personality is influenced by cultural factors, the HiTOP consortium has prioritized 96 multicultural perspectives to enhance the model's generalizability", how?

Author response: As recommended by the Associate Editor, we included a paragraph on how cultural factors influence personality (page 5, lines 100 to 110). As the main focus of the research did not center on cultural aspects and due to the word limit, we found this level of explanation sufficient.

2-State the inclusion criteria more clearly.

Author response: Thanks for your feedback. We tried to make the inclusion criteria more precise and more direct. Reviewing the procedure ensured that the inclusion criteria were mentioned in clinical (from page 5, line 123 to page 6, lines 125) and non-clinical samples (Page 6, lines 129 to 132).

3-Exclusion criteria are those that occur during the study. Please correct.

Author response: The Associate Editor is correct, and the changes were made in response to the notice from the Associate Editor (page 6, lines 132 to 134).

4-You can use the link below to enhance the concepts related to the personality.
https://brieflands.com/articles/ijpbs-123720

Author response: Thanks for your suggestion. We read this valuable article. The study structured the relationship between personality and severity of addiction. It seems that the concept of personality in this research is based on the BIG FIVE model of personality. The current manuscript is based on the five-factor model of pathologic personality traits (the pathological BIG FIVE). So, we briefly addressed the BIG-FIVE theory (page 2, lines 45 to 49). The introduction would become incoherent and lengthy if more details and concepts were included.

Note 1: we also correct a number on page 13, line 258.

Note 2: we mentioned figure 1 in page 13, line 259, and page 14, line 280.

3 Revision 2

3 comments · 18 Oct 2024 – 19 Oct 2024

Referee 4 Reviewer

ACCEPT 18 Oct 2024

THANKS

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 18 Oct 2024

Thanks.

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 19 Oct 2024

We have completed our review of your manuscript and are pleased to inform you that it is being considered for publication in Progress in Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences (previously named Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences). Note that the publication of your article will be finalized only with your cooperation in 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.