Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies
Volume 8 · Issue 2 · e110946

OPEN PEER REVIEW

A Study on the Factor Structure, Construct Validity and Reliability of the Activities of Daily Living of Iranian Children (ADLIC) Scale

Hossein Soltaninejad, mehdii alizadeh, Malahat Akbarfahimi, Akram Azad, Negar Miri Lavasani

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
15 Nov 2020	6 Feb 2021	7 Feb 2021	10.5812/mejrh.110946

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 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 5
3 **Revision 2** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 6
4 **Revision 3** Editor-in-Chief 7

1 Original submission

4 comments · 20 Nov 2020 – 23 Nov 2020

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 20 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
This manuscript has been written well, but I have some points for the authors to enhance its quality.
1. Use activities of daily living instead of activity of daily living.
2. The keywords have to be revised according to MeSH.
3. The introduction needs to be revised to show the gap. I do not agree with your opinion about tests such as wee FIM. These tests were designed to assess ADLs. Furthermore, I doubt that all of them have been translated into Persian.
4. You did not mention a previous preliminary study regarding the translation and face/content validity of the ADLIC in Iran.
5. Which version of SPSS did you use? Why did you use two software programs for analysis (lisrel+SPSS)?
6. After the factor analysis, were all the items of the questionnaire preserved, with no items deleted or merged?
7. The discussion needs to be revised. The discussion seems to be a repetition of the results in some cases.
Thanks.

Referee 2 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 21 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
Thank you for the opportunity to review the manuscript. The study investigated the construct validity and reliability of the ADLIC. This is an interesting issue. To improve the manuscript, some comments were attached in a Word file for the authors.
Also, the manuscript should be revised by a native English speaker.
Good luck.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 21 Nov 2020

Dear EIC,
Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. I carefully read the manuscript as well as the comments of the reviewers. Based on the reviewers' comments, the manuscript needs major revisions.
Thanks.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 23 Nov 2020

Dear Authors,
According to the reviewers' and associate editor's comments, your study needs major revision.
Thanks.

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.

The authors did not provide a point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments in this round.

2 Revision 1

4 comments · 26 Jan 2021 – 27 Jan 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 26 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
The authors revised the manuscript as requested by the reviewers. So, it is suitable for publication now.
Thanks.

Referee 2 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 27 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
Thanks to the authors for submitting the revised manuscript. Although many changes have been made to the manuscript, some of the issues stated in the attached file need to be addressed.
Thanks.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 27 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,
Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. I carefully read the manuscript as well as the comments of the reviewers. Based on the reviewers' comments, the manuscript needs minor revisions.
Thanks.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 27 Jan 2021

Dear Authors,
According to the reviewers' and associate editor's comments, your article requires minor revision. Please respond to the reviewers' comments and submit the required files.
Thanks.

3 Revision 2

2 comments · 30 Jan 2021 – 31 Jan 2021

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 30 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,
Thanks to the authors for revising the manuscript. The manuscript is ready for publication now.
Thanks.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 31 Jan 2021

Dear Authors
Thank you for improving the quality of the article. However, some grammatical problems are still observed in the manuscript. It is suggested that the article be edited by a native English-speaking editor and that you send the confirmation letter to the journal.
Thanks.

4 Revision 3

1 comment · 7 Feb 2021

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 7 Feb 2021

Dear Authors,
We are pleased to inform you that your article is accepted for publication in this journal.
Thanks.