PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 82739

Title: Operational definitions and measurement of externalizing behavior problems: An integrative review including research models and clinical diagnostic systems

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06083327

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Full Professor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Spain

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-03 01:48

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-09 05:22

Review time: 6 Days and 3 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

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 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. 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 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. 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.   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.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

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