OPEN PEER REVIEW

Open Peer Review (OPR)

As a new feature for progressing towards transparency, we decided to open a new window for all of our editors as well as authors titled "**Open Peer Review**". We hope by this new facility, our reviewers will be more motivated and authors will be more satisfied with the review process. We believe that publishing our peer review reports could make a transparent and clear environment for all our efforts within a journal, but not all reviewers tend to publish their comments.

What is "Open Peer Review" process?

An "Open Peer Review" process is making the details of all review process (including reviewers, associate editors, and EICs comments) as "Public" as it is agreed by EIC, Authors, and reviewers.

Advantages of "Open Peer Review" process

- More transparency, constructiveness and tactful comments of the peer review process: leads to an increase in the quality of reviews
- More motivations for all involved roles in the review process
- Authors' satisfactions from the review process: Increases honesty between authors and reviewers
- Education of both authors and new students
- Prevents reviewers from following their individual agendas and leading to the detection of reviewers' conflicts of interests

You can find out more at:
https://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Health Scope
Article DOI: 10.5812/jhealthscope.104116
Published in: Health Scope: 10(1); e104116

Peer Review Report for "The Effects of Family Psychoeducation Courses on Depression, Anxiety and Family Functioning in the Caregivers of Schizophrenic Patients"

Author(s): Seyed Alireza Haji Seyed Javadi, Seyedeh Zahra Hashemi, Seyed Mohsen Zamir

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	25 Apr 2020
Revised Date:	15 Nov 2020
Accepted Date:	10 Jan 2021

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 16 May 2020

Dear AE,

1- Please distinguish between the conclusion of the abstract and the introduction

2- Figure 1. Should be moved to the method section.

3- As stated in the methods section, the authors have used the paired t-test to analyze the data, but it seems that the data is not normally distributed and the SD is more that the Mean. Please explain or reanalyze.

4- The investigators have claimed that “The Chi-square test was used for comparison in cases where the distribution was not normal or for non-parametric variables”, but it is unknown where they have used these tests.

5- The authors should mention the method of calculating the sample size.

6- The number of samples in the first and second sessions is not the same.

How did the authors explain this discrepancy?

Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 19 May 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
- Abstract Requires additional changes and explanations (Type of study, study tools, statistical methods, software...).
- Match the keywords with the mesh (psychoeducation).
- It is not clear that which indices are intended to compute the sample size?
- Specify the method of selecting sample groups.
- Mention the inclusion and exclusion criteria.
- Add registration number and code of clinical trial registry.
- Where was the meeting place for educational intervention session?
- Please note the strengths and weaknesses of your study.
- Is there a limit to this study? If yes, please list all the current research constraints.
Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 15 Jun 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 18 Jun 2020

Dear Authors,
The second round of the review process is finished. According to reviewer comments, the manuscript needs “Major revision”.
Best Regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Dear respect editor in chief,

Thank you for useful comments for our manuscript and giving us an opportunity to improve our manuscript entitled "**The effects of family psychoeducation courses on depression, anxiety and family functioning in the caregivers of schizophrenic patients**". All suggestions were separately considered and addressed point-by-point. We have also repeated our experiments to fully answer your comments, and edited highlighted parts of manuscript. We hope that the revised form of our manuscript meets the Health Scope standards and would be satisfactory for publication.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

First reviewer

1-Please distinguish between conclusion of the abstract and introduction

Response:

According to dear referee advice, we distinguished between conclusion of the abstract and introduction.

2- The Figure 1. Should be moved to method section

Response:

The Figure 1 was removed from the manuscript, because its present was not necessary.

3-As stated in the methods section the authors have used the paired t-test to analyzing the data, but it seems that the data is not normally distributed and the SD is more that Mean. Please explain or reanalyze.

Response:

Thank you for your attention. Based on dear referee advice, we revised it.

4-The investigators have claimed that “The Chi-square test was used for comparison in cases where the distribution was not normal or for non-parametric variables”, but it is unknown that were they have used from these tests.

Response:

Thank you for your attention. Based on dear referee advice, we used Mann–Whitney test.

5-the authors should mention to the method of calculating the sample size

Response:

It was added in Method section.

6-The number of samples in the first and second sessions is not the same. How have the authors explained this discrepancy?

Response:

Thank you for your attention. Based on dear referee advice, we added about it in study limitation.

Second reviewer

Abstract Requires additional changes and explanations (Type of study, study tools, statistical methods, software...).

Response:

We revised the abstract according to the referee comment.

Match the keywords with the mesh (psychoeducation).

Response:

The keywords with the mesh (psychoeducation) was matched.

It is not clear that which indices have regarded to calculating the sample size?

Response:

It was added in Method section.

Specify the method of selecting sample groups.

Response:

It was added in Method section.

Mention the inclusion and exclusion criteria.

Response:

It was added in Method section.

Added registration number and code of clinical trial registry.

Response:

Added registration number and code of clinical trial registry was added in the manuscript.

Where was the meeting place for educational intervention session?

Response:

It was added in Method section.

Please mention the weak and strong points of your study

Response:

It was added in Discussion section.

Are there any limitations for this study? If yes, please mention all limitations of current study.

Response:

It was added in Discussion section.

Sincerely yours

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 11 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
The authors should highlight and specify all changes and then resubmit the manuscript.
Thnaks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 9 Nov 2020

Dear EIC,
In the manuscript entitled "The effects of family psychoeducation courses on depression, anxiety and family functioning in the caregivers of schizophrenic patients" the authors should highlight and specify all changes and then resubmit the manuscript.
with respect

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 12 Nov 2020

Dear Author,
According to reviewer comments, the manuscript needs "Minor revision".
Best Regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Dear respect editor in chief,

Thank you for useful comments for our manuscript and giving us an opportunity to improve our manuscript entitled "**The effects of family psychoeducation courses on depression, anxiety and family functioning in the caregivers of schizophrenic patients**". All suggestions were separately considered and addressed point-by-point. We have also repeated our experiments to fully answer your comments, and edited highlighted parts of manuscript. We hope that the revised form of our manuscript meets the Health Scope standards and would be satisfactory for publication.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

First reviewer

We yellow highlighted all changes requested of first reviewer

1-Please distinguish between conclusion of the abstract and introduction

Response:

According to dear referee advice, we distinguished between conclusion of the abstract and introduction.

2- The Figure 1. Should be moved to method section

Response:

The Figure 1 was removed from the manuscript, because its present was not necessary.

3-As stated in the methods section the authors have used the paired t-test to analyzing the data, but it seems that the data is not normally distributed and the SD is more that Mean. Please explain or reanalyze.

Response:

Thank you for your attention. Based on dear referee advice, we revised it.

In Table 1, irrelevant items were removed.
Data according to Anxiety and Depression in Table 2 after again reanalyzing, was revised.

4-The investigators have claimed that “The Chi-square test was used for comparison in cases where the distribution was not normal or for non-parametric variables”, but it is unknown that were they have used from these tests.

Response:

Thank you for your attention. Based on dear referee advice, we used Mann–Whitney test.

5-the authors should mention to the method of calculating the sample size

Response:

It was added in Method section.

6-The number of samples in the first and second sessions is not the same. How have the authors explained this discrepancy?

Response:

Thank you for your attention. Based on dear referee advice, we added about it in study limitation.

Second reviewer

We green highlighted all changes requested of second reviewer, in addition some comments were common for 2 reviewers, so some changes yellow were highlighted.

Abstract Requires additional changes and explanations (Type of study, study tools, statistical methods, software...).

Response:

We revised the abstract according to the referee comment.

Match the keywords with the mesh (psychoeducation).

Response:

The keywords with the mesh (psychoeducation) was matched.

It is not clear that which indices have regarded to calculating the sample size?

Response:

It was added in Method section.

Specify the method of selecting sample groups.

Response:

It was added in Method section.

Mention the inclusion and exclusion criteria.

Response:

It was added in Method section.

Added registration number and code of clinical trial registry.

Response:

Added registration number and code of clinical trial registry was added in the manuscript.

Where was the meeting place for educational intervention session?

Response:

It was added in Method section.

Please mention the weak and strong points of your study

Response:

It was added in end of Discussion section.

Are there any limitations for this study? If yes, please mention all limitations of current study.

Response:

It was added in Discussion section.

Sincerely yours

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 18 Dec 2020

Dear AE,
The authors have revised the manuscript based on the reviewer's comments.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 10 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript entitled "The effects of family psychoeducation courses on depression, anxiety and family functioning in the caregivers of schizophrenic patients" has been modified according to the reviewer's comments and is ready for the next step.
Kind regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 10 Jan 2021

Dear Author
Your article has been accepted for publication.
Best regards