

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://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html>



International Journal of Sport Studies for Health

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5812/intjssh-133215>

Published in: International Journal of Sport Studies for Health: 6(1); e133215

Peer Review Report for "Translation and Evaluation of the Reliability and Validity of Eating Disorder Inventory-3 Referral form Questionnaire Among Iranian University Students: A Cross-sectional Study"

Author(s): Haleh Dadgostar, Mohammad Sadegh Vashvashady, Mojgan Zarrini, Elham Dadgostar

Review Timeline:

▶ Submit Date:	14 Nov 2022
▶ Revised Date:	17 Jan 2023
▶ Accepted Date:	25 Jan 2023

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)

18 Nov 2022

Dear Authors

One of the strengths of this research is its applicability in sports nutrition science, which is certainly helped by the implementation of such research. In any case, there are some points needed to be responded and revised as follows:

1- Abstract

*In the abstract section, pay attention to these items and provide the necessary information

*You have used the word "feasibility" in the purpose mentioned in the abstract, while this word is not seen in the title of the research, please match and homogenize it.

*Please use statistical data such as p-value and appropriate statistical values in the results section of the abstract.

*Check the keywords based on Mesh Standard and remove the Iranian word from the

keywords.

2- Introduction

*In 48 and 49, please mention the relevant source.

*Please also mention the reasons for the importance of validation of such a questionnaire and state what advantages and superiority it has over the corresponding questionnaires and whether there is a similar example of it in the country or not?

* Use some examples of similar research literature.

3- Method

*Please include the objective section in the form of a separate sentence at the end of the introduction section and there is no need for a separate title.

*In the research methodology section, please register the code of ethics

*This sentence in line 103 and 104 seems to be incomplete, correct it.

"The responses which were at 104 the end of the extra and indicate the presence of the symptom or dysfunction"

*The following sentence should be mentioned in past tense in lines of 151 and 152

"The participants have to answer queries individually and if they have any question ask 152 from study observer"

4- Results

In the results section, you mentioned that 462 students were considered in the beginning and elsewhere this number was 400. Please check and correct it if there is any problem.

5- Discussion

If there are limitations to the research, mention them.

Better to refer to the possible use of such validated questionnaire in research.

 **SAMIRA POURMIRZAEI:** Reviewer | **Revision (0)**

5 Dec 2022

Dear Authors,

I have read your manuscript and have some comments as follows:

-In the keywords, it is better to use words that are not in the title. For example, you could add "eating disorders" and "questionnaire."


-On line 60, EDI-3 stands for Eating Disorder Inventory-3.

-In the methodology section, you should clarify your point. You state that the EDI-3 is a weak questionnaire, but then you go on to use it in your study. You should explain why you chose to use this questionnaire, and how you believe it is still a valuable tool for research.

-On line 94, you should write the number of men and women separately. For example, you could say "There were 200 men and 200 women in the study."

-In the sentence "(In low-weight participants few comments were given about questionnaire filling)," you should clarify what you mean by "comments." Do you mean that the participants did not provide any feedback on the questionnaire? Or do you mean that they provided negative feedback?

- The population of Iranian students in Iran is large. Why did you choose to study only 400 people? You should explain your rationale for choosing this sample size.
- On line 185, you should clarify whether the people who were found to have eating disorders were re-examined by the questionnaire.
- In the discussion section, you should start by summarizing the general and partial results of your work. This will help the reader to understand the main points of your study. You should also write the year this article was written (line 244).
- Finally, you should add the abbreviations for all tables and figures to the bottom of the document.

 **Maghsoud Nabilpour:** Associate Editor | **Revision (0)**

5 Dec 2022

I thank the authors for their valuable work. Here are some specific comments for the authors:

Please explain the following items and highlight the changes in the manuscript in green:

1- Rationale for sample size: The authors state that they chose a sample size of 252 participants because it is the "standard sample size" for studies of eating disorders. However, they do not provide any evidence to support this claim. In fact, the literature suggests that the optimal sample size for studies of eating disorders is much larger than 400 participants. I recommend that the authors revise their rationale for the sample size and provide evidence to support their claim. They may also want to consider increasing the sample size of their study.

2- Use of new reference: The authors cite a reference from 2004 in their manuscript. However, a more recent reference from 2015 has been published that provides more up-to-date information on the topic of eating disorders. I recommend that the authors update their reference list to include the more recent reference.

 **Morteza Taheri:** EIC | **Revision (0)**

7 Dec 2022

Dear Authors;
please kindly refer to the attached file and provide revisions in your manuscript.

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 Dr. Mohammad Sadegh Vashvashady,

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 do a "**Minor Revision**" on your manuscript. Even though this manuscript has enough quality to enter the review process, it needs some significant (**Minor**) **revisions** in some points of view.

How to Submit Revision?

Below you may find those comments. Please read them and answer them one by one. The **corresponding author** needs to prepare replies as below:

1. In a word file, reply to all comments one by one (reply to reviewer)
2. In the word file of your manuscript, reply and apply all comments as **marked or highlighted lines/paragraphs.**

Instruction <https://brieflands.com/journals/journal-of-clinical-research-in-paramedical-sciences/knowledgebase/display/resubmit-manuscript.html>

> Reviewers' Comments:

*Reviewer 1:
Dear Authors*

One of the strengths of this research is its applicability in sports nutrition science, which is certainly helped by the implementation of such research. In any case, there are some points needed to be responded and revised as follows:

1- Abstract

**In the abstract section, pay attention to these items and provide the necessary information*

**You have used the word "feasibility" in the purpose mentioned in the abstract, while this word is not seen in the title of the research, please match and homogenize it.*

Dear reviewer

Thank you for your valuable comment. I homogenize the title with the purpose of the abstract and remove "feasibility".

**Please use statistical data such as p-value and appropriate statistical values in the*

results section of the abstract.

Reply: Dear reviewer, I add p-value and other statistical data to the abstract, and highlighted them.

**Check the keywords based on Mesh Standard and remove the Iranian word from the keywords.*

Reply: I edited them as your comment.

2- Introduction

**In 48 and 49, please mention the relevant source.*

Reply: I added two references. (1-3)

**Please also mention the reasons for the importance of validation of such a questionnaire and state what advantages and superiority it has over the corresponding questionnaires and whether there is a similar example of it in the country or not?*

** Use some examples of similar research literature.*

Reply: Dear reviewer, thank you for your valuable comment. I have stated the importance of the study, in the text, as:

Two of the EDs, Anorexia and Bulimia nervosa, possess the highest mortality rate among the mental disorders and often correlate with depression, severe anxiety, and suicidal ideation (6). However, there is no immediate cure for these disorders, but by a different approach, recovery may earn. The success rate in treatment and recovery relates to disease identification (6, 7). Studies have revealed that the treatment gets more complicated as long as the disease remains undiagnosed

however, I added following:

In the last two decades, the study on the etiology, prevention and treatment of EDs has increased significantly.

And

A questionnaire that intensively examines all three eating disorders together and provides an acceptable result will definitely help to advance the treatment of this disorder.

And

To the best of our knowledge there is no the accurate statistics and the difference in language and norms of this questionnaire in our country in comparison with the

original one

3- Method

**Please include the objective section in the form of a separate sentence at the end of the introduction section and there is no need for a separate title.*

Reply: done.

**In the research methodology section, please register the code of ethics*

Reply: done.

**This sentence in line 103 and 104 seems to be incomplete, correct it.*

“The responses which were at 104 the end of the extra and indicate the presence of the symptom or dysfunction”

Reply: done.

**The following sentence should be mentioned in past tense in lines of 151 and 152*

“The participants have to answer queries individually and if they have any question ask 152 from study observer”

Reply: done.

4- Results

In the results section, you mentioned that 462 students were considered in the beginning and elsewhere this number was 400. Please check and correct it if there is any problem.

Reply: done

5- Discussion

If there are limitations to the research, mention them. Better to refer to the possible use of such validated questionnaire in research.

Reply: done

Limitation of our study is in our sampling method and nature of samples that we only studied the university students and another limitation is in the generalization of the results into the general population.

Reviewer 2:

- It is better to use words in keywords that are not in the title.

Reply: done

- On line 60, what does EDI-3 stand for?

I explained as:

EDI-3 (subsequent revisions of Eating Disorder Inventory), including 91 items; it is a self-report measure of psychological traits or constructs that allows the clinician to evaluate eating disorders symptoms, and assist them in providing treatment plans, also, developing required interventions, and monitoring progress in individuals with eating disorders

Methodology

- I'm not quite sure what your point of this manuscript is. Because if this questionnaire is weak, there are other questionnaires like EAT-26.

We found EDI-3 suitable for our study in presented sample, as It is an easy and standardized assessment tool whose scores and also following reason that have been explained in the discussion:

The latest version was EDI-3, introduced in 2004 and accepted by both DSM_IV and ICD-10. EDI- 3 RF is one of the eating disorder questionnaires applied by experts, and because it is an abbreviated format, it is much more helpful for patient screening. Because main questionnaires have lots of queries and filling out them is time-consuming, then a short questionnaire is the center of interest. But all of them were not approved by DSM or did not earn satisfying validity and reliability.

- On line 94, Please write the number of men and women separately

Reply: done

299 women, 153 men

- (In low-weight participants few comments were given about questionnaire filling). what is your mean?

Dear reviewer

Many thanks for valuable comment. I reviewed the thesis which the paper was extracted from. I deleted mentioned sentences and I completely edited the method section with attention to your points.

- The population of Iranian students in Iran is large. Why 400 people? On what basis did you choose 400 people?

Reply: Based on the mistake mentioned in above comments, the samples were 452 people. These numbers of the samples were available for our study.

- On line 185, Were the people who were found to have eating disorders to be re-examined by the questionnaire?

Reply: Yes, 40 of them.

Discuss

- It is better to talk about the general and partial results of your work in the first few lines of the discussion

Reply: done and highlighted

- Please write the year this article was written (line 244)

Reply: done and highlighted

- Abbreviations should be written at the bottom of the table 3

Reply: done and highlighted

DT = drive for thinness; BD = body dissatisfaction

B= bulimia

> Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

I thank the authors for their valuable work. Here I have some specific comments for the authors:

Please explain the following items and show the changes in the manuscript with a green highlight

1- Rationale for sample size

We obtained a repeated data when we reached to 400 people and further data collection would yield similar results but for assurance we continued the study to 452 person.

2- Use the new reference.

Reply: I added two new references in introduction and 1 in the discussion which have been highlighted.

> EIC Decision:

Dear Authors; please kindly refer to the attached file and provide revisions in your manuscript.

> Uploaded Files by Reviewers/Associate Editor/ or EIC: Below, you can find the list of files attached by reviewers or associate editor or EIC during the review process (if any).

No file

Kind Regards,
Author Support Center,
Brieflands

Have questions or need assistance?


- Please do not reply to this automated message.
- For further assistance, please contact our support: <https://brieflands.com/support>
- You can also talk to our Author Support Center by Online chat on our journal's websites.
- To ensure delivery to your inbox (not bulk or junk folders), please add no-reply@brieflands.com to your address book or safe senders list.

> Please consider the environment before printing this email.

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.

 **Maghsoud Nabilpour:** Associate Editor | **Revision (1)**

25 Jan 2023

Dear Editor,

I am satisfied with the answers provided by the authors.

Regards

 **Morteza Taheri:** EIC | **Revision (1)**

25 Jan 2023

Dear Authors

I would like to thank the reviewers for their careful consideration of the paper and for their helpful feedback. I am confident that it is now a stronger manuscript. Thank you again for your time and consideration.

I look forward to seeing your paper in print.