Review report

BSMMUJ-17.4 - 75288
The relationship of psychopathology with personality traits, social skills and peer relation among Indian adolescent girls
Yasin T *et al.* (tajbina.yasin@gmail.com)

REVIEW COMMENTS	AUTHOR RESPONSE
Date of submission: **2-Aug-24**	
A. Technical review	
ROUND 1	
Reviewer's name: **C: Pramath Chandra Sarker**	
ORCID: **0000-0003-0505-297X**	
Date assigned: **21-Aug-24**	
Date submitted: **2-Sep-24**	
Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s? **No**	
Do you wish to be disclosed to the author? **Yes**	
Comments sent to author **(**Date: **22-Oct-24)**	Date: **23-Oct-24**
1. Overview: The manuscript discusses an interesting investigation conducted in Assam, India. The topic is relevant, and it is commendable to see research that explores such specific and complex areas. It was unique because it used a variety of psychological scales. However, several significant concerns need to be addressed to enhance the quality and rigor of the study. Therefore, I recommend a major revision before the manuscript can be considered for publication. In the following, I will first provide my general comments and concerns. Then, section by section, I have outlined my questions, remarks, and suggestions, which might be helpful for the author(s) to improve the paper. I discovered over 150 grammatical errors and numerous small errors. Please review it carefully. I think the author has not given enough emphasis to the article. You can seek help from an experienced person or use software (like Grammarly or QuillBot).	
6. Are the methods described in sufficient detail so that the study could be reproduced? **= No** 6a. Please explain how to use the formula to determine sample size. Describe the process of choosing participants through a straightforward random sampling method. The instrument description section should not include the author's name and year on the subheading. Describe the statistical software used, if any. Please include the psychometric properties (or Cronbach's alpha) of the APRI and APS scales. Noting that the questionnaire and scales have a large number of items (BFI scale 44 items, SSS 24 items, APRI scale 18+18 = 36 items, APS 115 items). The questionnaire contains a total of 244 items (excluding demographic and behavioral questions), which poses a significant challenge in maintaining the attention of participants, particularly adolescents.	• The formula used to determine sample size has been described in the manuscript from line no 104 -108 • The participants were selected through purposive sampling method. • The instrument description has been modified as per the suggestion provided. (line no. 116, 122, 127, 133). • The statistical software has been mentioned in (line no. 149-150). • The psychometric properties for APRI and APS scales has been included (line no.132, 139-140). • Yes, it was challenging and hence informed consent was taken from the adolescents and their response were taken in proper classrooms. Moreover, they were given prior briefing about the length of the questionnaires.
10. Is the discussion section critical and comprehensive about the main message of the manuscript? **= No** 10a. Please pay attention to the discussion section. You should explain the results that you obtained and whether they	The discussion section has been modified as per the suggestions and it has been made clear regarding the findings of the study, related studies were also included.

REVIEW COMMENTS	AUTHOR RESPONSE
support the findings of the previous study. If not, why not? Please provide reasons. It seems that there is a significant gap in the discussion section.	
12. Are the references appropriate in number and up-to-date? = **No** 12a. There are several mistakes in the reference section. I suggest that you carefully check all the references. For example, in reference number 1, you wrote "Dwivedi S N." However, in Vancouver style, it should be written "Dwivedi SN" without a space between S and N. You can do this quickly and easily with Google Scholar or Scribbr (https://www.scribbr.com/citation/generator/). I also noticed that references 14 and 27 are the same.	The references were corrected as per the suggestion provided.
13. Are statements of the manuscript supported by appropriate reference(s)? = **No** 13a. It's noted that there are 6 references before 2000, 10 references before 2010, and 9 references before 2020, but only 9 references between 2020 and 2024.	The references were revisited and from 9 it has been increased to 12 references between 2020 and 2024.
16. Is the standard of English acceptable for publication? = **No** 16a. I found over 150 grammatical errors and numerous small mistakes. Please review it carefully. I think the author has not given enough emphasis to the article. You can seek help from an experienced person or use software (like Grammarly or QuillBot).	The grammatical errors were checked thoroughly and it has been rectified as per the suggestions provided.
Reviewer's recommendation: **Revisions Required**	
Editor's comments	
Editor's name: **M Mostafa Zaman**	
ORCID: **0000-0002-1736-1342**	
1. Kindly revise your content on the ethical clearance stating the name of IRB, the approval Memo with date.	The justification has been written in the manuscript from line no. 269-273.
2. Table 1: The number of subjects that have appeared dozens of times, which could be given after the title within parenthesis (n=150). The title of this table is grossly inadequate	Table 1 has been revised accordingly.
3. Tables 2-4: You have scores of r values, most of which are weak or very weak (r<0.4), irrespective of their p values. Your interpretation should not be based on p values but rather on absolute values of r. Presentation of your data in a Bland-Altman plot will clarify it. Revise the tables and texts related to these tables.	Tables 2-4 have been revised as per the Editor's comments.
4. Table 5: This table is unnecessary; a text description is sufficient.	Table 5 has been removed
5. Introduction: This section needs severe pruning. Please shed off half of it. I suppose you keep only one sentence objective, given that you have four hypotheses.	The Introduction section is revised.
6. Methods: The manuscript is needed to be prepared with adequate attention to statistical analysis and presentation of the results. 7. You have to add a subsection for statistical analysis in the Methods section. Sample size calculation deserves special attention because of issues of multiple testing for four hypotheses. Should your	The Methods section has been revised as per the comment. Statistical analysis section added as per the suggestion.

REVIEW COMMENTS	AUTHOR RESPONSE
sample size estimation not need another multiplier by four? Considering this, I suggest you drop the hypothesis and keep only the objective. This will simplify your storytelling and increase the probability of acceptance.	
8. Results section: It is lengthy; kindly keep the key information related to the main message of the manuscript.	The Result section's length is reduced keeping the key information
9. Discussion: The above correction will dictate the revision of this section.	The Discussion has been updated to align with the Result section
Editor's decision: **Revisions Required**	
ROUND 2	
Editor's name: **M Mostafa Zaman**	
ORCID: **0000-0002-1736-1342**	
Comments sent to author **(**Date: **10-Nov-24)**	Date: **11-Nov-24**
1. The Abstract's word count is 275. It should be 250 or less. The background could easily be shortened.	The word count of the Abstract section is reduced to 250.
2. The Introduction is still lengthy, at 876 words. We encourage authors to limit the word count to around 500.	The Introduction section's length is reduced to 500.
3. I suggested your result descriptions claiming meaningful association only for those r>=0.4. Please ignore others as weak correlations irrespective of p values.	We have ignored weak correlations irrespective of *P* values.
4. The Discussion should begin with your key findings. The first paragraph of your Discussion is too long. Please divide it into two hepatic paragraphs to improve its readability.	The Discussion sections is revised as it begins with key findings.
Editor's decision: **Revisions Required**	
ROUND 3	
Reviewer's name: **C: Pramath Chandra Sarker**	
ORCID: **0000-0003-0505-297X**	
Date assigned: **11-Nov-24**	
Date submitted: **23-Nov-24**	
Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s? **No**	
Do you wish to be disclosed to the author? **Yes**	
Comments sent to author **(**Date: **26-Nov-24)**	Date: **26-Nov-24**
1. Overview: I've found two issues during this second revision that require more work before we can finalize the manuscript. Most of these issues are minor and easily resolved: I would like to request grammatical corrections. The text contains numerous unnecessary uppercase letters. It is important to be careful with subject-verb agreement in various texts. The description reveals that the original version of psychological scales took place in English. However, the reader may find it difficult to understand the procedure, regardless of the participant's familiarity with the English language.	
17. Is the standard of English acceptable for publication? **= No** 17a. However, the manuscript contains numerous grammar errors, such as subject-verb agreements, uppercase, and past tense usage.	It has been modified in the manuscript as per the suggestion provided.
Reviewer's recommendation: **Revisions Required**	

REVIEW COMMENTS	AUTHOR RESPONSE
Reviewer's name: **D: Shelina Fatema Binte Shahid**	
ORCID: **0000-0001-8999-7115**	
Date assigned: **11-Nov-24**	
Date submitted: **25-Nov-24**	
Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s? **No**	
Do you wish to be disclosed to the author? **Yes**	
1. Overview: The study area chosen by the authors is very contemporary. Its implication may provide significant importance in assessing the mental health condition of female adolescents. The article reflects originality and appears methodologically sound. There are some minor points to edit. After editing the minor points these articles will be a good one as there is coherence among the Study title, objectives, result and conclusion. Overall, there are no major points to edit.	
3. Does the abstract provide a complete and accurate description of the content of the article? = **No** 3a. Please mention the problem statement of the study in the abstract. Objective of the study is also not mentioned in this section according to the title.	The problem statement and objective of the study has been incorporated in the background in a comprehensive manner.
4. Are the study objective(s) clearly stated and logical? = **No** 4a. Study objectives are mentioned clearly but author could include demographic correlates with the variables.	The objectives were formulated to explore the association between the independent and dependent variables in the current study.
5. Is the rationale/justification for conducting the study clear? = **No** 5a. Please mention the rationale of the study before objective of the study.	The rational of the study has been added in the manuscript (line no. 87-91)
6. Are the methods described in sufficient detail so that the study could be reproduced? = **No** 6a. The authors could not clarify the method of study design. e.g. Cross-sectional design. In the method section place of the study should be elaborated, Like- how many colleges? how data were collected? how sampling error was minimized? (Line no. 96). Inclusion and exclusion criteria should be mentioned.	The method of the study is correlational approach and it has been mentioned in the line no. 108. The place of the study has been mentioned in line no. 98 and it has been elaborated in line no. 99-103. The inclusion and exclusion criteria have been added in the line no. 109-114
10. Is the Discussion section critical and comprehensive about the main message of the manuscript? = **No** 10a. The discussion section was comprehensive but could not state the strengths and limitations of the study.	The strengths and limitations have been added as per the suggestion in line no 246-250
13. Are the references appropriate in number and up to date? = **No** 13a. References are appropriate in number but need to revise Reference no. 2,5,23 and 29 (lines no. 255,256,263,264,265,327,328,346,347,348) these are too old and not present appropriately.	The references 2, 5, 29 are related to the study title and it has provided relatable contents. Reference no. 23 is a reference of Adolescent Psychopathology Scale.
17. Is the standard of English acceptable for publication? = **No** 17a. Language is reader friendly but there are some minor grammatical and typing mistakes.	The grammatical errors have been modified.
Reviewer's recommendation: **Revisions Required**	
Editor's comments	

REVIEW COMMENTS	AUTHOR RESPONSE
Editor's name: **M Mostafa Zaman**	
ORCID: **0000-0002-1736-1342**	
1. As you and the IRB approval indicate, the paper is based on Tajbia Yasin's PhD work. I wonder whether the choice of authorship sequence is appreciable! The PhD student should be the first author unless there are obvious reasons. If she had no role in the conceptualisation and design of the study, how could it be her doctoral thesis work? Let us know your views on it.	The author's position has been reordered.
2. Introduction: Avoid bullets and mention the objective in one sentence.	Bullets have been avoided and objectives have been mentioned in one sentence.
3. Procedure should be replaced by the "Data collection" subheading (line 123).	Procedure have been replaced by the Data Collection subheading
4. Statistical analysis: You mentioned correlation and regression analysis, but I see correlation (r) only. Write it in the past tense.	Regression analysis has been added in the results and it has been modified to past tense.
5. Discussion: Start the section reiterating your key findings—then spiral around it all over the storytelling.	Discussion has been modified (line no. 236-245).
6. Author contributions: Follow the Journal's style.	Author's contributions have been modified and followed according the Journal's style
7. Write complete sentences for the funding and COIs (lines 238-241).	Complete sentences were added for the funding and COI
8. Table 1: Provide results up to one decimal point using the Mean (Standard deviation) style. Table 2-4: Prepare the tables in the landscape to avoid two blocks of data; the readings might get confused when reading two sets of results in one table. These are a continuation of the results of the same variables. Provide full names of all acronyms in the footnotes of these tables.	Table 1. has been modified as per the suggestion. Tables 2-4 were converted to landscape and full names were provided for all the acronyms in the footnote of the tables as per the instruction provided.
Editor's decision: **Revisions Required**	

B. Editorial decision	Date: **28-Nov-24**
Final decision: **Accepted** subject to editorial clarifications.	