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://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijpbs.68152
Published in: Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 14(4); e68152

Peer Review Report for "Effects of Telephone Versus Paper-and-Pencil Self-Administration of the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) in Child and Adolescent Outpatients: Evidence From Iran"

Author(s): Zahra Shahrivar, Vandad Sharifi, Hadi Zarafshan, Mojgan Khademi, Morteza Jafari Nia, Ahmad Hajebi, Farid Abolhassani Shahreza

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	3 Mar 2018
Revised Date:	30 Jun 2020
Accepted Date:	11 Aug 2020

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 2 Mar 2019

Dear Author,
Your paper has been evaluated by external peer reviewers. Please do your revisions according to the reviewers' comments. I appreciate you to do the revisions as soon as possible by using the track changes mode in MS Word and using colored text.
After revision authors are obliged to upload reviewers' comments word file in which they have replied to all comments one by one.
Also please add the "Ethical Committee" approval code.
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.
Thanks.

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.

Response to editor

Dr Mehdi Tehranidoost: tehranid@tums.ac.ir

Dr Shabani: am.shabani@gmail.com

Dr Mohammadi: a-mohammadi@tums.ac.ir

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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision (1)** 22 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
In Title:
1- Please eliminate unnecessary words. “Comparability of”
2- Please modify the title in this way, in an Iranian outpatient child and adolescents
Abstract
3- A structured abstract is required including these headings: Background, Objectives, Methods, Results and Conclusions. Please add a Background and sampling method. 4- In method section please write about where and when your study was done
5- Study design?
6- Method of analysis?
7- P-value?
Method section:
In method section you should also consider some points
8- What was your study design?
9- Please write the demographic characteristics of patients and their parents.
10- How selected participants?
11- How calculated sample size?
12- What controls that you applied to prevent of biased selection of participants?
13- Who was assistant of research that applied measures what was her/his expertise?
In measure section
14- Please mention the exact amount of internal consistency, cut-offs, scoring, subscales and other psychometric properties
Results section:
16- Please mention SD is abbreviation of standard deviation for the first time
17- The tables were not well organized please modify them
18- In tables please replace “SDQ scales scores” with “SDQ subscales scores”
19- In table 1 replace “First/ Follow up appointments Groups” compare mean.
20- According to table 1 Hyperactivity / Inattention compare mean was significant but the p-value of that write (0.11) that show not significant!
21- According to the name of “Strengths and difficulties questionnaire (SDQ) “this measure has two section Strengths and difficulties but your study just report difficulties I haven’t seen this q, please edit this if my comment make sense.
Discussion section:
22- When you report the results of present study, you shouldn’t reference to cichitti! The

agreement between the two types of administration (ICC) in all subscales were excellent (24)
23- Please mention compare mean of Hyperactivity / Inattention subscale was significant and discuss about this
24- Please discuss MORE about your main results: positive correlation between two administrations of Q.
25- The results of the present study place/put in the body of knowledges in this field
26- In the end of discussion, you should discuss about generalizability of your finding or external validity
27- Then you should discuss about how this finding would help to lay the groundwork of a theory or expand the present knowledge.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (1)** 4 Oct 2019

Dear EIC,
Thanks to the authors for submitting the valuable manuscript.
Please consider the reviewer's comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (1)** 4 Oct 2019

Dear Author,
Please accept my apologies for the inconvenience caused delayed response.
Your paper has been evaluated by external peer reviewers. Please do your revisions according to the reviewers' comments. I appreciate you doing the revisions as soon as possible by using the track changes mode in MS Word and using colored text.
After revision authors are obliged to upload reviewers' comments word file in which they have replied to all comments one by one.
Also please add the "Ethical Committee" approval code.
Besides, please pay attention to the word count limitation: Word Count (including references and title page) should not be more than 3500 words. Original articles' maximum number of references is 55, Maximum Number of illustrations/Tables is 5. Otherwise, you should pay an extra charge to the publisher.
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.
thanks.

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.

Response to reviewer:

Dear reviewer,
We implemented all of your corrections.
You also can find responses to items 11, 20, and 21.
Best

Reviewer 1:
In Title:
1- Please eliminate unnecessary words. "Comparability of". Done
2- Please modify title in this way, in an Iranian outpatient child and adolescents. Done
Abstract
3- A structured abstract is required including these headings: Background, Objectives, Methods, Results and Conclusions. Please add a Background and sampling method.

4- In method section please write about where and when your study was done. Done
5- Study design? Cross-over?? Done.
6- Method of analysis? Done.
7- P value? Done.
Method section:
In method section you should also consider some points
8- What was your study design? Done.
9- Please write the demographic characteristics of patients and their parents.
10- How selected participants? Done.
*11- How calculated sample size? Done. "*We considered α=0.05, power= 0.8, and ICC= 0.7 to 0.9. The minimum estimated sample size was equal to 52, but we increased it to 66.*"*
12- What controls that you applied to prevent of biased selection of participants? Done.
13- Who was assistant of research that applied measures what was her/his expertise? Done.
In measure section
14- Please mention the exact amount of internal consistency, cut-offs, scoring, subscales and other psychometric properties. Done.
Results section:
16- Please mention SD is abbreviation of standard deviation for the first time. Done.
17- The tables were not well organized please modify them. Done.
18- In tables please replace "SDQ scales scores" with "SDQ subscales scores". Done.
19- In table 1 replace "First/ Follow up appointments Groups" compare mean. Done.
20- According to table 1 Hyperactivity / Inattention compare mean was significant but p value of that write (0.11) that show not significant! We said "except for the Hyperactivity/Inattention scale in pen and paper administration mode (p=0.04)."
21- According to the name of "Strengths and difficulties questionnaire (SDQ) "this measure has two section Strengths and difficulties but your study just report difficulties I haven't seen this q, please edit this if my comment make sense. "The prosocial subscale is the strengths part of the SDQ".
Discussion section:
22- When you report the results of present study, you shouldn't reference to cichitti! The agreement between the two types of administration (ICC) in all subscales were excellent (24). Done.
23- Please mention compare mean of Hyperactivity / Inattention subscale was significant and discuss about this. Done.
24- Please discuss MORE about your main results: positive correlation between two administrations of Q. Done
25- The results of the present study place/put in the body of knowledges in this field. Done.
26- In the end of discussion, you should discuss about generalizability of your finding or external validity. clinical sample as a screening or outcome measure. Done.
27- Then you should discuss about how this finding would help to lay the groundwork of a theory or expand the present knowledge. Done.

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.

Soheila Shahshahani: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) — 4 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
It is the revised version of the manuscript and seems that the authors corrected it based on the opinion of previous reviewers. Yet I have some comments:
- In the abstract: It seems that ”intra-class correlation" and "reliability" aren’t good for being keywords for this paper.
- In the measures: Please add something about the psychometric characteristic of the original version of the questionnaire and the scoring method of test.
- In the discussion: Although many readers know what is the method of evaluating the ICC, I think it is better to describe it.
Thanks.

Yazdan rajeh Naderi : Reviewer | **Revision** (2) — 10 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
1- to make your paper searchable (and findable!) please consider, SDQ in keywords is incorrect, write the complete form of " strengths and difficulties questionnaire"
2- also to make your paper searchable (and findable!) please replace "child and adolescent" with intra-class correlation.
Thanks.

Yazdan rajeh Naderi : Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) — 10 Jun 2020

Dear EIC,
It is the revised version of the manuscript based on the opinion of the previous review. Yet we have some comments:
- In the abstract: It seems that” intra-class correlation" and "reliability" aren’t good for being keywords for this paper. Please replace reliability with “psychometric properties” in this section
- In the measures: Please add something about the psychometric characteristic of the original version of the questionnaire and the scoring method of the test.
1- to make your paper searchable (and findable!) please consider, SDQ in keywords is incorrect, write the complete form of the " strengths and difficulties questionnaire"
2- to make your paper searchable (and findable!) please replace intra-class correlation with "child and adolescent"

best wishes

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 13 Jun 2020

Dear Author,
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 do your revisions according to these comments. I appreciate you to do the revisions as soon as possible by using the track changes mode in MS Word and using colored text.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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.

Final responses to reviewers' comments:

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
no comment
Reviewer 2:
dear author
1- to make your paper searchable (and findable!) please consider, SDQ in keywords is incorrect, write the complete form of " strengths and difficulties questionnaire"

The manuscript is corrected based on this comment.

2- also to make your paper searchable (and findable!) please replace "child and adolescent" with intra-class correlation

The manuscript is corrected based on this comment.

Reviewer 3:
It is the revised version of the manuscript and seems that the authors corrected it based on the opinion of previous reviewers. Yet I have some comments:
In the abstract: It seems that "intra-class correlation" and "reliability" aren't good for being keywords for this paper.

The manuscript is corrected based on this comment.

In the measures: Please add something about the psychometric characteristic of the original version of the questionnaire and the scoring method of test.

The manuscript is corrected based on this comment.

In the discussion: Although many readers know what is the method of evaluating the ICC, I think it is better to describe it.

The manuscript is corrected based on this comment.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
dear author
hi
It is the revised version of the manuscript based on the opinion of the previous reviewing. Yet we have some comments:
In the abstract: It seems that" intra-class correlation" and "reliability" aren't good for being keywords for this paper. Please replace reliability with "psychometric properties" in this section
In the measures: Please add something about the psychometric characteristic of the original version of the questionnaire and the scoring method of the test.

1- to make your paper searchable (and findable!) please consider, SDQ in keywords is incorrect, write the complete form of " strengths and difficulties questionnaire"

The manuscript is corrected based on this comment.

2- to make your paper searchable (and findable!) please replace intra-class correlation with "child and adolescent"

The manuscript is corrected based on this comment.

best wishes

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (3) — 12 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
I do agree with associate editors comments that have summed up the disagreement between editors.
Thanks.

Soheila Shahshahani: Reviewer | **Revision** (3) — 13 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
Thank you for inviting me to review the manuscript "Telephone vs paper-and-pencil self-administration of the strengths and difficulties questionnaire (SDQ) in an Iranian outpatient child and adolescent sample". It is the revised version and seems that the authors corrected it based on the opinion of reviewers.
Sincerely yours
S. Shahshahani

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (3) — 16 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

Yazdan rajeh Naderi : Associate Editor | **Revision** (3) — 24 Jul 2020

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (3) — 11 Aug 2020

Dear Author,
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.

Thanks.