

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_87921
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Psychometric Properties and Validation of Mini-International Personality Item Pool (IPIP) among Nigerian Population</b>
Type of the Article	

### **General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Abstract</b> Please revise:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the method section, the sampling technique was simple random. Which one is true?</li> <li>Please use common term for Mage = 46.49 SD=6.23 change to mean age 46.49 ± 6.23.</li> <li>48.4 of what?</li> <li>Please add the analysis technique to validate this questionnaire</li> </ol> <p><b>Keyword</b> Please revise this. Use the term provided in Pubmed</p> <p><b>Background</b> Please state more reasons why this study is important to validate Mini-IPIP since so much research has been done to determine Cronbach alpha..</p> <p><b>Methodology</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No informed consent taken before the study? How was this questionnaire distributed? Online or paper-based? What language did the researcher use for this questionnaire?</li> <li>Why did this study compare mini-IPIP with BFI-10? Please add in the background the purpose for comparing with BFI-10. What impact resulted from this BFI-10 on the subject?</li> <li>Please revise. State the score for each Likert scale.</li> <li>Please add. How to calculate this questionnaire. Example extraversion for which #item? Were there any reversed scores?</li> <li>Please add. What analysis did the author use for this study?</li> </ol> <p><b>Table 1</b> Please revise this table.</p> <p><b>Result</b> Please state the total Cronbach alpha total for Mini-IPIP</p> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please state more reasons why this Internal consistency is lower for this population? Was it due to the small population or else?</li> <li>Please revised. The references only showed 25, but the manuscript showed 26</li> <li>Please add. The limitation of this study is the future research for Mini-IPIP. Longitudinal study for validation of index?</li> </ol> <p><b>Ethical</b> Please state the registration number of ethical clearance.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Title</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mini-IPIP</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p><b>Title</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggestion: To add a more valuable study, if possible, please use factor analysis instead of Pearson and Cronbach alpha. Several previous studies have already reported internal consistency and Cronbach alpha for Mini-IPIP</li> </ol> <p><b>Methodology and conclusion</b> Suggestion: this pattern should be described much better in factor analysis.</p> <p><b>Table 3</b> Cronbach alpha below 0.70 was deemed as questionable. Suggestion: Please review again the raw data; which subject was an outlier, try to remove this subject, and calculate the data again. If possible, please add more subjects to this study.</p>	

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> Maybe. The author stated that "Before starting the study, the researcher approached the head of units for permission. After they were briefed on the study's objective, a representative of the staff was assigned to the researcher to assist in distributing the questionnaires to willing and consenting staff."	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Indrayadi Gunardi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universitas Trisakti, Indonesia</b>