Journal of Health Reports and Technology
Volume 12 · Issue 1 · e166361

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Frequency of Stuttering Symptoms Among Kurdish-Persian Bilingual Children and Teenagers: Comparative Evidence Between Two Languages

Amir Shiani, Fatemeh Darabi, Elahe Lorestani, Hiwa Weisi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
16 Sep 2025	3 Nov 2025	5 Jan 2026	10.5812/jhrt-166361

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 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 5

Authors' reply to reviewers 6

Reviewer and editor comments 9

1 Original submission

4 comments · 3 Oct 2025 – 7 Oct 2025

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 3 Oct 2025

Hello
Thank you for submitting your article.

1. The references need to be updated, and some of the references are very old.

2. Please clarify what fundamental role your study plays in society and how it contributes.

Referee 2 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 7 Oct 2025

Dear AE,
Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to review this manuscript.
Here are my comments:
1. The abstract lacks detailed information on the eligibility criteria, potential sources of bias, and how the study size was determined.
2. There is no discussion of the limitations or generalizability of the study results.
3. The abstract could benefit from more detailed participant characteristics and a discussion of efforts to control for confounding variables.
4. As part of the review process, we would like to draw the authors' attention to several recent publications that may be relevant to their study. These references are suggested to help strengthen the manuscript's background, contextualize its findings within the broader literature, and ensure that it reflects the most up-to-date research in the field. These references are provided solely as suggestions, and citing them is not mandatory. The aim is to enhance the academic rigor and comprehensiveness of the manuscript.
The suggested article is listed below:
A. Digital Distractions: The Link Between Screen Time and Speech Development in Iranian Toddlers
* Reason: This article discusses speech development in young populations, which is relevant to understanding factors influencing stuttering in bilingual children.
** Link: https://brieflands.com/articles/jcp-164701

Final Decision: Minor Revision
Kind Regards | Publishing Assistant

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 7 Oct 2025

Dear corresponding author
We are pleased to send you the review comments, included at the bottom of this letter. Please consider these suggestions. We look forward to receiving your revision and your point-by-point response to these comments. When you revise your manuscript, please highlight the changes you make using bold or colored text. All authors must check and approve the revision before you submit it.

Editorial comments:
• Structure the manuscript according to the following sections, and number the sections only in the main text. In this manuscript, the objectives are missing from the abstract.

Abstract text:
O Background
O Objectives
O Methods
O Results
O Conclusions

Main text:
O 1- Background
O 2- Objectives
O 3- Methods
O 4- Results
O 5- Discussion
O 5-1- Limitations
O 5-2- Conclusions

• Spell out each abbreviation at its first occurrence in the manuscript text. For subsequent occurrences, use only the abbreviation.

• The sampling method and statistical software used should be stated in the "Methods" section of the abstract.

• Some sentences are ambiguous and need editing. For example: Line 21: "To sum up, although, few types of stuttering symptoms". Please attach a certificate of English editing when resubmitting.

• Footnotes: If the following sections (especially Authors' Contribution, Conflict of Interests, and Ethical Approval) are not included, the manuscript will be returned to the author.
- Authors' Contribution? Should be completed.
- Conflict of Interests?
- Ethical Approval? Should be completed.
- Funding/Support? Should be completed.
- Informed Consent? If applicable!
- Data availability?

• In English, a period should be used instead of a slash. Some numbers in the tables are written with "/". The entire manuscript should be checked for this and corrected if necessary.

• According to the journal's guidelines, references should be numbered in parentheses and listed at the end in Vancouver format. The entire discussion section must be checked and its references corrected. If this correction is again not made, your article will either be rejected or returned.

• "Limitations of the Study" must be presented as a subheading (5.1) before the "Conclusions section".

• The discussion section needs major editing. Some sentences are ambiguous and lack conceptual and semantic coherence. This section is difficult for the reader to understand. The entire manuscript (especially the discussion section) needs to be reviewed and edited by an English language expert. In this section, it is necessary to explain the reasons for the similarities or differences between the findings of previous studies and those of the present study.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 7 Oct 2025

Dear corresponding author
I am pleased to inform you that the editor and reviewers have now commented on your paper. In its present

form, the paper requires some corrections before it can be published in the Journal of Health Reports and Technology. In addition to submitting the revised manuscript, you must prepare a file called "Reply to Reviewers" and answer each of the editor's and reviewers' questions one by one. Also, the corrections made to the manuscript should be highlighted so that the editor and reviewer can easily identify your corrections. If the revised manuscript is not highlighted or the "Response to Reviewers" file is not submitted to JHRT, we will have to return the manuscript to you again, and this will prolong the peer review process for your manuscript.
Best regards;
Editor in Chief of JHRT
Yahya Pasdar (Ph.D.)

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 Reviewer

Manuscript ID: 166361

Manuscript Title: Frequency of Stuttering symptoms among Kurdish-Persian Bilingual Children and Teenagers: Comparative evidence between two languages

Reviewer 0	
Comments	Response
1. The references need to be updated and some of the references are very old	Given that not many studies have been conducted in this field, the sources were updated as much as possible.
2. Please clarify what fundamental role your study plays in society and how it contributes?	The introduction shows the role of reading in society and the importance of the subject.
Reviewer 1	
1. The abstract lacks detailed information on the eligibility criteria, potential sources of bias, and how the study size was determined.	The study abstract was revised, and more detailed information was provided on the study design, sampling and statistical methods, and eligibility criteria.
2. There is no discussion of limitations or generalizability of the study results.	At the end of the study discussion, a limitations section was added. The generalizability of the study was also mentioned.
3. The abstract could benefit from more detailed participant characteristics and a discussion on efforts to control for confounding variables.	The abstract was revised based on more detailed participant characteristics. The study methodology and discussion were also revised.
4. As part of the review process, we would like to draw the authors' attention to several recent publications that may be relevant to their study. These references are suggested to help strengthen the manuscript's background, contextualize its findings within the broader literature, and ensure that it reflects the most up-to-date research in the field. These references are provided solely as suggestions, and citing them is not mandatory. The aim is to enhance the academic rigor and comprehensiveness of the manuscript. 5. Reason: This article discusses speech development in young populations, relevant for understanding factors influencing stuttering in bilingual children.	We would like to thank the esteemed referees for their valuable guidance and used the relevant resources.
Associate Editor's Comments	
Dear corresponding author We are pleased to send you the review comments,	All corrections have been made to the text of the article. Changes are highlighted in color in the

included at the bottom of this letter. Please consider these suggestions. We look forward to receiving your revision and your point-by-point response to these comments. When you revise your manuscript, please highlight the changes you make in the manuscript by using bold or colored text. All authors must check and approve of the revision before you submit it.	text. All questions have also been answered one by one.
Editorial comments	
1. *Write structured manuscript based on following sections and then it must be numbered only for main text. In this manuscript, the objectives for abstract section is missed.* *Abstract text:* *O Background* *O Objectives* *O Methods* *O Results* *O Conclusions*	The article was revised in a structured manner according to the journal format, and all relevant sections in the abstract, including background, objectives, methods, results, and conclusions, were revised.
2. *Main text:* *O 1- Background* *O 2- Objectives* *O 3- Methods* *O 4- Results* *O 5- Discussion* *O 5-1- Limitations* *O 5-2- Conclusions*	The original text of the article was modified according to the journal format and a limitations section was added.
3. Throughout the manuscript text, write the full phrase related to abbreviation for first time. For other cases, just provide the abbreviation.	Abbreviations in the revised text prevented repetition.
4. The sampling method and statistical software used should be stated in the "Methods" section of the abstract.	The sampling method and statistical software used should be mentioned in the "Methods" section of the abstract.
5. Some sentences are ambiguous and need editing. For example: Line 21: "To sum up, although, few types of stuttering symptoms". Please attach a certificate of English editing when resubmitting.	The text has been corrected in English.
6. Footnotes: Without mentioning the following sections (especially Authors' contribution, conflict of interests and ethical approval), the manuscript will be returned to the author. - Authors' Contribution? Should be	All of the following sections (especially author contributions, conflicts of interest, and ethical approval) are listed in the article. - Author contributions were written.

completed. - Conflict of Interests? - Ethical Approval? Should be completed. - Funding/Support? Should be completed. - Informed Consent? If applicable! 7. - Data availability?	- Conflict of interest was revised in the article. - Ethical approval? Revised in the article. - Funding/support? Revised in the article. - Informed consent? Revised in the article. - Data availability was revised in the article.
8. In English, the slash symbol should be a dot. Some table numbers are written as "/". The entire manuscript should be checked for this and corrected if necessary.	Throughout the article, the decimal point was changed to a period (.).
9. According to the journal's guidelines, references should be numbered in parentheses and listed at the end according to Vancouver format. The entire discussion section must be checked and its references corrected. If the correction is not made again, your article will either be rejected or returned.	Corrected
10. It is necessary that "Limitations of the Study" be presented as a sub-title (5.1) before the "Conclusions section".	“Limitations of the Study” was revised as subheading (5.1) before the “Conclusion Section”.
11. The discussion section needs major editing. Some sentences are ambiguous and lack conceptual and semantic coherence. It is difficult for the reader to understand. The entire manuscript (especially the discussion section) needs to be reviewed and edited by an English language expert. In this section, it is necessary to explain the reasons for the similarities or differences between the findings of previous studies and the present study.	The article title has been corrected.

2 Revision 1

3 comments · 18 Nov 2025 – 5 Jan 2026

Referee 2 Reviewer

ACCEPT 18 Nov 2025

Dear AE,

Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to review this manuscript once more.
The authors have addressed the comments and revised their manuscript substantially. Therefore, this manuscript is recommended for publication without further revisions.

Kind Regards | Publishing Assistant

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 5 Jan 2026

The revised manuscript (ID: 166361) has been sufficiently improved. The authors have adequately addressed the editorial and reviewer comments and provided satisfactory answers to all points. Therefore, the revised manuscript can be considered for publication in the "Journal of Health Reports and Technology."

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 5 Jan 2026

Dear author;
We are pleased to accept your manuscript (ID: 166361) in its present form. It will now be forwarded to the publisher for copyediting and typesetting.

Best regards;
Editor in Chief of JHRT
Yahya Pasdar (Ph.D.)