

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Psychometric properties of the South Oaks Gambling Screen Revised for Adolescents (SOGS-RA) in Chinese adolescent gamblers

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Marta Lima-Serrano

Submitted on: 23 Oct 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1605182

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The study assessed the validity and reliability of the South Oaks Gambling Screen-Revised for Adolescents in Chinese population. This is the most used tool to evaluate the gambling disorder in adolescents. It shows optimal psychometric proprieties and the optimal cut-off was assessed

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

As strengths I highlight that the study was carried out in a large sample of randomized selected adolescents. Moreover, multiple psychometric proprieties were assessed, including the estimation of cut-off for diagnosis. As limitation is that the study was carried out only in adolescents enrolled in schools

Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

Dear authors, thank you for give me the opportunity of review your manuscript, which shows an interesting and novel study that assess the psychometric proprieties of the South Oaks Gambling Screen-Revised for Adolescents in Chinese population.

Following I give some comments that can help to improve your work.

1. The title is not descriptive of the objective of the study as well as the short title
2. Reorder the introduction: 1. Justification, including the impact of the problem worldwide and particularly in China; 2. Theoretical framework; 3. Background and gap to fill-in; 4. Objective (please, do not include methodological issues in this section). Please, be sure that you explain what adds the SOGS-RA to other diagnosis tools. i.e., the DSM-5 diagnosis criteria?
3. Method:
 - a. Start the method with the description of the design then describe the targeted population and then the inclusion criteria.
 - b. How covid-19 affected your data collection?
 - c. Who administered the questionnaires?
 - d. Include a flow-chart.
 - e. You must include the information about ethical approval (ethical board, approval number)
 - f. The measures' section is not clear, please describe the instruments with detail, include a complementary material if needed. All the scales are appropriate for adolescents? The cutoff score of ≥ 4 of the DSM-5 diagnosis criteria was previously stablished for adolescents?
 - g. The expenses amount was asked in USD?
 - h. Include the cut-off criteria for all the psychometric measures.
4. Discussion: Do not repeat/include results. In which Chinese population was validated the SOGs (reference 58). Include strengths of the study

5. References: There are too much references, some of them very old. Considered reduce the number. Some of them do not use an appropriate style

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

The title is not descriptive of the objective of the study as well as the short title

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

Yesit

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

it is clear to me, but I am not an expert in English language

Q 7 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

Q 8 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)

There are too much references, some of them very old. Considered reduce the number. Some of them do not use an appropriate style

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9 Originality



Q 10 Rigor



Q 11 Significance to the field



Q 12 Interest to a general audience



Q 13 Quality of the writing



Q 14 Overall scientific quality of the study



REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Major revisions.