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://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Health Scope
Article DOI: 10.5812/jhealthscope.111561
Published in: Health Scope: 10(2); e111561

Peer Review Report for "The Impact of Couple Therapy Based on Relationship Enrichment Approach on Couples' Intimacy and Sexual Function"

Author(s): Somayyeh Khazaeian, Ali Navidian, Abolfazl Payandeh, Nayereh Niatmoghadam

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 24 Nov 2020
Revised Date: 30 Mar 2021
Accepted Date: 15 Apr 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)

2 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1- English writing is very poor and should be revised
2- The statistical symbols have not been used correctly. For example, this sentence in the abstract is unclear and should be revised "Considering the size of the effect of female sexual function (η2 = 0.389) and men (η2 = 0.473), we can say that 38% of the mean difference in the score of female sexual function and 47% of the difference in the mean score of male sexual function was due to the intervention"
3- The sampling method should be explained completely. For example, how have the 4 centers been selected? And how have they been randomized in two intervention and control centers?
4- Please use "." Instead of "/" for all decimals.
5- All analyses should be revised and the researchers should check the interaction between time and group with Repeated measures analysis of variance. Using Simultaneously RMA and T-Test is not correct

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 10 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,
According to reviewers' comments, the article is prepared to publish.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 10 Jan 2021

Dear Author
According to reviewers' 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.

Greetings and best regards to the respected editor of the magazine Health scope

Dear Editorial board

While thanking the esteemed judges for the effort of judging, article ID: 111561 entitled "The impact of couple therapy based on relationship enrichment approach on couples' intimacy and sexual "function

:The answers to the questions raised by the esteemed editorial board are provided to you as follows

Reviewer 1:

1- English writing is very poor and should be revised

Reply: The article was revised based on reviewer's comment.

2- The statistical symbols have not been used correctly. For example, this sentence in the abstract is unclear and should be revised "Considering the size of the effect of female sexual function (η2 = 0.389) and men (η2 = 0.473), we can say that 38% of the mean difference in the score of female sexual function and 47% of the difference in the mean score of male sexual function was due to the intervention"

Reply: The abstract was revised based on reviewer's comment.

3- The sampling method should be explained completely. For example, how have the 4 centers been selected? And how have they been randomized in two intervention and control centers?

Reply: The sampling method was revised based on reviewer's comment.

4- Please use "." Instead of "/" for all decimals.

Reply: The decimals was revised based on reviewer's comment.

5- All analyses should be revised and the researchers should check the interaction between time and group with Repeated measures analysis of variance. Using Simultaneously RMA and T Test is not correct

Reply: We revised all analyses again. All effects (including interactions) were checked using two-factor repeated measures ANOVA. Thus, the comparisons between groups were reported in each time (Table 2, 3, and 4). We also checked all assumptions needed for all analyses.

Sincerely: Niatmoghadam, correspond author

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) 27 Feb 2021

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 4 Mar 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
- Abstract, Objective: remove "in Zahedan."
- Abstract: Method: revise "in Zahedan in 2020" to in the southeast of Iran in 2020.
- Abstract: results:: "The findings indicated that education had a significant effect on increasing intimacy and sexual function in intervention group over time". Indicate to scores before and after.
- The manuscript should be checked by a native expert in English Language. Grammatical errors are seen in manuscript.
Background:
- Describe about the importance of study in Iran and Zahedan.
- Indicate to Tables in the text.
- Indicate to limitations and ethical code of the study.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 10 Mar 2021

Dear AE,
Comment for the manuscript of The impact of couple therapy based on relationship enrichment
- Table 1: Comparison of demographic characteristics of the research groups Decision:
- Job (Male) and Job (Male): In results, in job three categories are mentioned the Housewife, Employee and Non-governmental? the Non-governmental……
- It has seemed that Non-governmental employee must be written.
- A native English revision is needed.
Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 10 Mar 2021

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (1) 11 Mar 2021

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.

Editor-in-Chief: **Dear Prof. (Dr.) Ramazan Mirzaei**
Journal of Health Scope
We appreciate your e-mail and the reviewer's constructive and positive comments on our manuscript entitled "The impact of couple therapy based on relationship enrichment approach on couples' intimacy and sexual function". We have now revised the manuscript and explained responses to each comment. The changes in the revised manuscript are highlighted. We hope you find the corrections satisfactory

Reviewer 1:
The authors have revised the manuscript based on the reviewers' comments
Thank you for your attention

Reviewer 2:
Abstract, Objective: remove "in Zahedan."
Thank you. Zahedan was removed.
Abstract: Method: revise "in Zahedan in 2020" to in the southeast of Iran in 2020.
Thank you. It was corrected and highlighted.
Abstract: results: "The findings indicated that education had a significant effect on increasing intimacy and sexual function in intervention group over time". Indicate to scores before and after.
The manuscript should be checked by a native expert in English Language. Grammatical errors are seen in manuscript.
Thank you for your attention, it was corrected and highlighted.
Background:
Describe about the importance of study in Iran and Zahedan.
It was included in the introduction and highlighted.
Indicate to Tables in the text.
Thank you, tables were highlighted in the text.
Indicate to limitations and ethical code of the study.
Limitations and ethical code were indicated and highlighted

Reviewer 3:
Comment for the manuscript of the impact of couple therapy based on relationship enrichment
Table 1: Comparison of demographic characteristics of the research groups Decision:
Job (Male) and Job (Male): In results, in job three categories are mentioned the Housewife, Employee and Non-governmental? The Non-governmental ……
It has seemed that Non-governmental employee must be writhen
Thank you, it was corrected
A native English revision is needed.
Thank you for attention. It is done

Best regards

Corresponding Author: Nayyereh Niatmoghadam

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 9 Apr 2021

Dear EIC,
According to the revised article and reviewers' viewpoint, the manuscript is suitable for publishing.
Thanks.

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (2) 15 Apr 2021

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