Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies
Volume 12 · Issue 4 · e160552

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Assessment of the Validity and Reliability of the Persian Version of the Breakup Distress Scale and Its Relationship with Resilience Among College Students

Negar Mousivand, Masoume Pourmohamadreza-Tajrishi, Jahangir Mohammadi Bytamar

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
15 Feb 2025	13 May 2025	1 Jul 2025	10.5812/mejrh-160552

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 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 8
3 **Revision 2** Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 9
Authors' reply to reviewers 10
Reviewer and editor comments 12

1 Original submission

4 comments · 2 Mar 2025 – 13 Apr 2025

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 2 Mar 2025

The study is well-structured, employing a robust methodological approach, including confirmatory factor analysis and reliability testing. The sample size is adequate, and the statistical analyses, including CFA and regression, provide valuable insights. However, a few areas require further clarification and improvement. First, while the study demonstrates strong internal consistency, more discussion on cross-cultural validity and potential biases in self-reported data would strengthen the findings. Second, the authors removed Item 11 due to a low factor loading but did not elaborate on its conceptual implications—was this item inherently problematic, or could it reflect cultural differences? Additionally, while resilience was a key focus, the discussion could benefit from a deeper exploration of how resilience interventions might mitigate breakup distress. Lastly, minor linguistic and formatting issues should be addressed to enhance readability. Overall, the study contributes meaningfully to the field, but addressing these points will improve its clarity and impact.

Referee 2 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 11 Apr 2025

1. The purpose of the study is mentioned in the background and objectives sections of the abstract; it is better to say it in one place.
2. Some sentences, particularly those in the introduction, appear to lack proper sourcing, for example, in the second paragraph of the introduction and the fourth paragraph.
3. The problem statement is not related to a psychometric study; instead, it focuses more on the challenges associated with breakup stress. Additionally, it does not address the importance of resilience or explain why it is one of the goals of this study. In the introduction, you should have elaborated more on the previous tools and the reasons for your choice, as well as the second part of the work, which is resilience.
4. The objectives section of the study is inconsistent with the problem statement, and the introduction section needs significant revision.
5. In line 108 of the methods section, for the Persian version of the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC), the mentioned reference is not relevant!
6. In the methods section, the guidelines for translating the questionnaire are not clear; there is no mention of the basis for these guidelines.
7. In the Methods section, it is not clear how to examine the second goal and how to do it.
8. Why is it only confirmatory factor analysis and internal consistency that have been measured to evaluate the validity and reliability of the instrument? There is no need to check the content validity!!
9. The method section needs serious review.
10. Due to the above-mentioned issues and the lack of clarity in the objectives, the reason for conducting the study, and the methodology, the article needs major revision.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 12 Apr 2025

Thanks for submitting your valuable manuscript to the journal. As a result of this, we would like to inform you that the review of your manuscript is finished, and based on the editorial decision, you need to make a

"Major Revision" to your manuscript. Even though this manuscript is of sufficient quality to enter the review process, it needs some significant (major) revisions in some respects.

Editor-in-Chief MAJOR REVISION 13 Apr 2025

Dear Authors
According to the reviewers' and associate editor's comments, your article needs major revision. When revising your manuscript, please consider all issues mentioned in the reviewers' comments carefully: please outline every change made in response to their comments and submit the required files.

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.

Dear Sir/Madam

We would like to express our gratitude for the valuable comments from the esteemed reviewers. We would like to inform you that the necessary revisions have been highlighted in the text in different colors according to each reviewer's feedback, as detailed below:

Reviewer 1: The revisions were done and highlighted with red line.

Comment: First, while the study demonstrates strong internal consistency, more discussion on cross-cultural validity and potential biases in self-reported data would strengthen the findings.

Answer: it was discussed base on cross-cultural validity and potential biases in self-reported data to strengthen the findings.

Comment: Second, the authors removed Item 11 due to a low factor loading but did not elaborate on its conceptual implications—was this item inherently problematic, or could it reflect cultural differences?

Answer: It was mentioned in second paragraph of discussion section.

Comment: Additionally, while resilience was a key focus, the discussion could benefit from a deeper exploration of how resilience interventions might mitigate breakup distress.

Answer: It was mentioned in 13th paragraph of discussion section.

Comment: Lastly, minor linguistic and formatting issues should be addressed to enhance readability.

Answer: All sections of article revised linguistically and base on human skills.

Comment: Overall, the study contributes meaningfully to the field, but addressing these points will improve its clarity and impact.

Answer: It was addressed the contributions of the study to the field in conclusions section.

Reviewer 2: The revisions were done and highlighted with blue line.

Comment 1. The purpose of the study is mentioned in the background and objectives section of the abstract; it is better to say it in one place.

Answer: According to the format of the Journal, it should be in separate sections.

Comment 2. Some sentences, particularly those in the introduction, appear to lack proper sourcing, such as in the second paragraph of the introduction and the fourth paragraph.

Answer: All the sentences specially in the introduction revised thoroughly and the appropriate references were used.

Comment 3. The problem statement is not related to a psychometric study; instead, it focuses more on the challenges associated with breakup stress. Additionally, it does not address the importance of resilience or explain why it is one of the goals of this study. In the introduction,

you should have elaborated more on the previous tools and the reasons for your choice, as well as the second part of the work, which is resilience.

Answer: The problem was related to a psychometric property and the importance of resilience was addressed. In the introduction the previous tools were mentioned and the reasons of my study was mentioned.

Comment 4. The objectives section of the study is inconsistent with the problem statement, and the introduction section needs significant revision.

Answer: The introduction section revised thoroughly and the objectives section rearranged consistent with the problem.

Comment 5. In line 108 of the methods section, for the Persian version of the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC), the mentioned reference is not relevant!

Answer: Samani and Jokar (the mentioned reference) administered CD-RISC and reported its psychometric properties in Iranian people in their article.

Comment 6. In the methods section, the translation guidelines of the questionnaire are not clear; there is no mention of the basis for these guidelines.

Answer: It was cleared in the methods section.

Comment 7. In the Methods section, it is not clear how to examine the second goal and how do it.

Answer: It was mentioned in the second phase of the last paragraph in methods.

Comment 8. Why is it only confirmatory factor analysis and internal consistency that have been measured to evaluate the validity and reliability of the instrument? There is no need to check the content validity!!

Answer: The content validity was addressed during the translation process of the instrument, as highlighted in the final paragraph of the methodology section.

Comment 9. The method section needs serious review.

Answer: It was thoroughly revised.

Comment 10. Due to the above-mentioned issues and the lack of clarity in the objectives, the reason for conducting the study, and the methodology, the article needs major revision.

Answer: It was mentioned and revised.

Associate Editor’s Comments (Review Assistant Comments): The revisions were done and highlighted with green line.

1. **Title and Abstract:**
    - **Peer Review:** The abstract does not explicitly mention the study design as "cross-sectional," which should be included for clarity.

Answer: The study design as cross-sectional was included in the abstract.

2. **Setting:**
    - **Peer Review:** The setting is described as involving Iranian students, but specific locations and dates are not mentioned.

Answer: The dates and locations were mentioned in the methods section.

3. **Bias:**
    - **Peer Review:** The abstract does not mention efforts to address bias, which should be considered.

Answer: The limitations were added to address bias which should be considered.

4. **Study Size:**
    - **Peer Review:** The sample size of 350 students is mentioned, but the rationale for this size is not provided.

Answer: It was mentioned in the methods the rationale for the sample size.

5. **Participants:**
    - **Peer Review:** The number of participants is reported, but details on stages of participation are not provided.

Answer: It was mentioned all participants remained in the study from start to finish with no exclusions.

6. **Descriptive Data:**
    - **Peer Review:** Basic demographic information is provided, but more detailed characteristics could enhance the study.

Answer: All demographic gathered in the study were mentioned in Table 4.

7. **Limitations:**
    - **Peer Review:** Limitations are not discussed in the abstract, which is a critical omission.

Answer: It was discussed in the abstract.

8. **Interpretation:**
    - **Peer Review:** The interpretation aligns with the study objectives but lacks a discussion of limitations.

Answer: It was added in the discussion.

2 Revision 1

3 comments · 8 May 2025 – 12 May 2025

Referee 2 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 8 May 2025

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting the revised version of your manuscript. Following the completion of the previously requested corrections, I would like to offer the following comments regarding the updated version:
1. Although the introduction has been expanded, particularly regarding other available tools, the newly added content still lacks proper academic references.
2. Certain methodological concerns that the first reviewer and the editor raised remain unresolved; I will refrain from repeating them here.
3. The introduction continues to lack fluency and coherence in presenting the research problem, especially concerning the second objective of the study.
3. In the Methods section, the second objective and the approach for its assessment should be clearly and explicitly described.
4. The remaining revisions have been appropriately addressed.

In conclusion, if the above-mentioned issues are adequately addressed, the manuscript will be considered suitable for acceptance.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 10 May 2025

Respecting, below you may find the reviewers' comments about your manuscript, which we hope will be useful for your manuscript.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 12 May 2025

Dear Authors
According to the reviewers' and associate editor's comments, your article requires minor revision. When revising your manuscript, please consider all issues mentioned in the reviewers' comments carefully: please outline every change made in response to their comments and submit the required files.

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.

Dear Sir/Madam

We would like to express our gratitude for the valuable comments from the esteemed reviewers. We would like to inform you that the necessary revisions have been highlighted in the text in different colors according to each reviewer's feedback, as detailed below:

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Thanks for revision. Good Luck

Answer: Thank you very much for your valuable comments.

Reviewer 2:
Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting the revised version of your manuscript. Following the completion of the previously requested corrections, I would like to offer the following comments regarding the updated version:
1. Although the introduction has been expanded, particularly about other available tools, the newly added content still lacks proper academic references.

Answer: The comments have been addressed in the background section and are highlighted in yellow.

2. Certain methodological concerns that the first reviewer and the editor raised remain unresolved; I will refrain from repeating them here.

Answer: Thank you for your valuable feedback and constructive critique. We have carefully reviewed your comments and made significant revisions to enhance the clarity, transparency, and methodological rigor of our manuscript. All 350 participants initially recruited met inclusion criteria, completed the questionnaires, and remained in the study throughout without exclusions. We clarified this process by explicitly stating that participant retention was 100%, with no dropouts. We included this detailed power analysis in the Methods section to justify our sample size explicitly.

3. The introduction continues to lack fluency and coherence in presenting the research problem, especially concerning the second objective of the study.

Answer: A refined, cohesive and fluent version of my text was added, emphasizing clarity and logical flow to better convey the research problem – particularly concerning the second objective.

4. In the Methods section, the second objective and the approach for its assessment should be clearly and explicitly described.

Answer: The Research Procedure subsection has been included, and all previously noted comments have been thoroughly addressed.

5. The remaining revisions have been appropriately addressed.

In conclusion, if the above-mentioned issues are adequately revised, the manuscript will be considered suitable for acceptance.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1: Respecting, Below you may find the reviewers' comments about your manuscript which we hope to be useful for your manuscript.

EIC Decision:

Dear Authors
According to the reviewers and associated editor's comments, your article needs to be revised minor. When revising your manuscript, please consider all issues mentioned in the reviewers' comments carefully: please outline every change made in response to their comments and submit the required files up to one month.

3 Revision 2

3 comments · 28 Jun 2025 – 1 Jul 2025

Referee 2 Reviewer

ACCEPT 28 Jun 2025

accept

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 29 Jun 2025

accept

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 1 Jul 2025

Dear Authors
We are pleased to inform you that your article is accepted for publication in the MEJRHS. We hope to receive other high-quality articles from your group.