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

Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Article DOI: 10.5812/semj.95166
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 21(6); e95166

Peer Review Report for "Validating the Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale Among Middle Eastern Migrants: Linear Versus Orthogonal Approaches"

Author(s): Neda Hashemi, Maryam Marzban, Bernadette Sebar, Neil Harris

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 7 Jul 2019
Revised Date: 5 Feb 2020
Accepted Date: 7 Feb 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: Reviewer | **Revision** (0)

26 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
- Your manuscript needs some revision in both grammatical.
- The title of this study should be modified.
- ABSTRACT: abstract is adequate, but needs to be edit.
- Keywords should be corrected and should be revised.
- Introduction: The literature review in the introduction section must be improved.
- Introduction: should add some new references published in Shiraz E-Medical Journal and another similar journal.
- Materials and Methods: please add the time duration of the research.
- Materials and Methods: Please describe how the target population was selected, in detail.
- Materials and Methods: Please define the abbreviation.
- Result: Carefully check that all Tables.
- Result: Please define the abbreviation.
- Discussion: The Discussion section must be improved.
- Discussion: Please highlight your study's strengths and limitations.

- Conclusion: there is differing between the conclusion of the abstract and the full text.
- The references should be revised.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 28 Oct 2019

Dear EIC,

Based on the reviewer's comment, the manuscript needs major revision.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 28 Oct 2019

Dear Author,

The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.

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.

Dear Editor-in-Chief

Thank you for your email dated [28 Oct 2019] enclosing the reviewers' comments. We have carefully reviewed the comments and have revised the manuscript accordingly. Our responses are given in a point-by-point manner below. Changes to the manuscript are shown in yellow highlights. We hope that you find our responses satisfactory and that the manuscript is now acceptable for publication.

Sincerely,

Response to Reviewer:

Thank you for your review of our paper. We have answered each of your points below. Changes to the manuscript are shown in yellow highlights.

- **Your manuscript needs some revision in both grammatical.**

The manuscript has been reviewed and revised by a native editor with experience in the specialized field.

- **The title of this study should be modify.**

The title of the study (paper) was modified based on the reviewer’s comment.

Abstract:

- **Abstract is adequate, but need to be edit.**

The abstract has been language-edited by a native editor in the specialized field.

- **Key words should be corrected and should be revised.**

Based on the journal's guideline, keywords were revised and were provided according to the MeSH terms.

Introduction:

- **The literature review in introduction section must be improved.**

In the introduction section, the literature review has been improved by adding more explanations and information regarding previous related studies and also by adding more relevant references.

- **Should add some new references published in Shiraz E-Medical Journal and other similar journal.**

Three articles published by Shiraz E-Medical Journal were identified to be relevant to the introduction of the article and thus were added as new references.

Materials and Methods:

- **Please add the time duration of research.**

The time duration of the research was added to the “procedure” section of Methods.

- **Please describe how the target population was selected, in details.**

A detailed description on how the target population was selected was added to the “procedure” section of Methods.

- **Please define the abbreviation.**

The definition of the abbreviation “CFA” was added to the “procedure” section of Methods.

Results:

- **Carefully check that all Tables.**

All tables were reviewed. The definition of all abbreviations mentioned in the tables were added to the table notes and the tables were formatted based on the journal's guideline. Please kindly let us know if any further changes are required in the tables.

- **Please define the abbreviation.**

In the result section, all abbreviations in the text and tables have been defined.

Discussions:

- **The Discussion section must be improved.**

The discussion has been improved by adding a separate section name “strengths and limitations” to the discussion and also by making changes to the conclusion section. In addition, the discussion was language-edited by a native editor with experience in the specialized field. The authors believe that the discussion section is comprehensive and includes all related information on the findings of previous research and also on the comparison between pervious research findings and the current study findings. This is because the authors have previously conducted a systematic review entitled “A systematic review

of the scales used for the measurement of acculturation" (under review by International Journal of Intercultural Relations), and thus believe that all previous studies on validating SL-ASIA have been found and addressed in the discussion section of the current paper. However, if, in the reviewer's opinion, the discussion still needs further changes, the authors would be happy to make more changes based on the reviewer's suggestions.

- **Please highlight your study's strengths and limitations.**

The strengths and limitations of the study have been added to the discussion as a section named "strengths and limitations".

Conclusion:

- **There is differing between conclusion of abstract and full text.**

The conclusion of full-text was changed based on the conclusion of abstract.

References:

- **The references should be revised.**

The reference list was reviewed and revised based on the journal's guideline.

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) — 17 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1. The title of table 1 &3 is the same. Correct it.
2. Please report the p-value for RMSEA in table 1&3.
3. Why didn't the authors calculate ICC(inter class correlation) for reliability in table 2 and 4?
4. It's better the authors report standardized weights in Figures 1&3 before validation.
5. The authors didn't report the reference for the detection of cut points in table 5.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 19 Jan 2020

Dear EIC,
I would like to inform you that the manuscript needs minor revision based on the reviewer's comment listed bellow:
1. The title of table 1 &3 is the same. Correct it.
2. Please report pevalue for RMSEA in table 1&3.
3. Why didn't the authors calculate icc(inter class correlation) for reliability in table 2 and 4?
4. It's better the authors report standardized weights in figure 1&3 before validation.
5. The authors didn't report the reference for detection of cut points in table 5.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 20 Jan 2020

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
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.

Dear Editor-in-Chief

Thank you for your email dated [20 January 2020] enclosing the reviewers' comments. We have carefully reviewed the comments and have revised the manuscript accordingly. Our responses are given in a point-by-point manner below. Changes to the manuscript are shown in yellow highlights. We hope that you find our responses satisfactory and that the manuscript is now acceptable for publication.

Sincerely,

Response to Reviewer:

Thank you for your review of our paper. We have answered each of your points below. Changes to the manuscript are shown in yellow highlights.

1. The title of table 1 &3 is the same. Correct it.

The title of Table 1 & 3 were modified based on the reviewer's comment.

2. Please report p-value for RMSEA in table 1&3.

The PCLOSE value for RMSEA has been added to Table 1 & 3.

3. Why didn't the authors calculate icc (inter class correlation) for reliability in table 2 and 4?

This study is a part of a larger study on the association between socio-cultural factors and well-being among Middle Eastern migrants in Australia. Before carrying out the actual study, a pilot study was conducted on twenty young adult Middle Eastern migrants to test the validity and reliability of study scales and feasibility and functionality of the research procedure. Throughout the pilot study, the test-retest reliability was measured by determining the correlation between the subscale scores for the first and second administration of the study measures (including 26-item SL-ASIA) where there was an interval of one to four weeks between administrations. However, given the focus of the current paper is on validating linear and orthogonal SL-ASIA and considering Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability have already been reported as indicators of reliability in the actual study, the authors decided to not include any further information on reliability of SL-ASIA from the pilot phase. However, the inter class correlation coefficients for SL-ASIA subscales have been reported below. If, in the reviewer's opinion, they still need to be added to Table 2 & 4, the authors would be happy to do so.

Linear SL-ASIA: Language/cultural preference (ICC= 0.899); Interaction (ICC= 0.830); Generational identity (ICC= 0.828); Ethnic identity and pride (ICC= 0.807); Food preference (ICC= 0.769); Generation/ geographic history (ICC= 0.708)
Orthogonal SL-ASIA: Value (ICC= 0.892); Behavioural competency (ICC= 0.873); Self-identity (ICC= 0.840)

4. It's better the authors report standardized weights in figure 1&3 before validation.

Standardized weights have been added to Figure 1 & 3.

5. The authors didn't report the reference for detection of cut points in table 5. (method, result, table)

The reference for detection of cut points has been added to Table 5 and methods and result sections of the manuscript.

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.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 7 Feb 2020

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.