

## **REVISION FILE**

### **REVIEWER 1**

**Scientific Quality:** Grade B (Very good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Minor revision

**Novelty of This Manuscript:** Grade B (Good)

**Creativity or Innovation of This Manuscript:** Grade B (Good)

**Scientific Significance of the Conclusion in This Manuscript:** Grade B (Good)

The authors, through their panoramic approach, aim to review the theories of operational definitions used in the design of tests that objectively assess externalizing disorders with the most frequently used tests and their various implications. Basis on which this work is carried out in order to propose an operational definition of the tests integrating different theoretical perspectives, with the aim of achieving conceptual equivalence. The text is well written with correct and clear English with a structured methodology and a rich and relatively recent bibliography.

The synthetic exposition of the problem by the operational definition at the same time by the means of the systems of classifications and by evaluation of the behavior of externalizations makes the strong point of this work.

It reflects the dimensional outline of the problem by giving access to possible instrumental tools for diagnosis and evaluation.

We thank the reviewer for his dedication in reading the MS and for his comments.

Nevertheless, it is desirable that the authors better target the title by clearly identifying the approaches used.

Following the reviewer's suggestions, the authors have proceeded to change the title of the MS. Now read as follows:

*A review of operational definitions and measurement of externalizing behavior problems among DSM, ICD and recent dimensional research models: Implications for research and clinical practice*

## **REVIEWER 2**

**Scientific Quality:** Grade B (Very good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Accept (General priority)

**Novelty of This Manuscript:** Grade B (Good)

**Creativity or Innovation of This Manuscript:** Grade A (Excellent)

**Scientific Significance of the Conclusion in This Manuscript:** Grade B (Good)

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to review this manuscript, "Conceptual approaches and measurement of externalizing behavior problems: An integrative approach of research models and clinical diagnostic systems".

The purpose of this study was to review the theoretical frameworks underpinning the operational definitions of externalizing disorders, revise the different measurement alternatives existing, and provide an integrative operational definition. My comments are outlined below and I sincerely hope that the authors find them helpful in any future revisions of their work.

- 1. The introduction is well written which clearly pointed out the knowledge gap in the literature. Besides, I appreciate the authors conducted this review study which contributes a lot in the clinical practice.**

The authors would like to thank the reviewer for his appreciation and effort in revising the manuscript.

- 2. In page 1, you stated These include the HiTOP model [17], please provide the full title of this model at the first time. So was the same problem on page 2, that you stated that differentiation between the presence or absence of a disorder (e.g., SCID [19-21], CIDI [22]). Please also provide the full title before using abbreviations**

Following the reviewer's recommendations, the authors have incorporated the full title before using abbreviations. We have also checked the whole text for other possible errors of this type.

3. At p5, you mentioned that you conducted a bibliographic search " in the Pubmed and PsycInfo databases with the keyword "assessment," confined to the years corresponding to these editions of the classification systems, reveals, firstly, the non-existence of diagnostic instruments based on the first versions of the DSM and the ICD". I suggest you add the search time information, because the results retrieved at different time points may be different, and this information should be clearer, which is conducive to readers' reading.

Following the reviewer's suggestions, the authors have clarified the search period used.

4. At p13, you have made several critics on the existing instruments, I suggest you provide the examples with adding the literature source. So are the same situations that you stated "we have observed how authors eliminate items, correlate item errors, or establish cross-loading without reflecting on the impact on the test content validity." The examples provided here would help readers to understand the issues you observed.

Following the reviewer's suggestions, the authors have incorporated some examples of articles in which we detected some of the practices that, from our perspective, are not correct from a psychometric perspective.

5. Due to the length of your manuscript, I suggest adding a summary and conclusion at the end of the article, which will help readers recall the content of this article again and help readers to read.

According to the reviewer proposal the authors have include a summary and conclusions at the end of MS