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: https://doi.org/10.5812/jhealthscope.120007
Published in: Health Scope: 11(1); e120007

Peer Review Report for "Explanation of Experiences of Iranian Women on the Verge of Divorce Regarding Rationality"

Author(s): Shahin Taghi, Maryam Nakhaei, Seyyed Abolfazl Vagharseyyedin

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 11 Oct 2021
Revised Date: 7 Mar 2022
Accepted Date: 8 Mar 2022

Revision (0)

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

Maryam Seraji: Reviewer | Revision (0)

7 Nov 2021

Dear author
please:
1- Abstract: Accuracy and robustness of information
2- Type of content analysis method
3- Help questions should be arranged in the form of a table
4- Information should be reported based on five Granium steps.
5- How to use it for information accuracy and robustness? reference?
6- Demographic table
7- In the second theme, it is suggested that the title be corrected to the lack of understanding of marital issues instead of marital distress.
8. Send a coded interview.
9- Research environment is not specified for coding? Software or Word?
10- Limited study implementation
11- The original codes extracted? How many codes have been reduced in the process of reviewing, comparing, and creating classes? To be added in the results section.
12- Title: Explanation of experiences .... be added

13- Reference 14-19-22-23 according to the structure of the journal

Nasrin Rezaee: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 9 Nov 2021

The file is attached.

Hassan Okati-Aliabad: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 5 Dec 2021

Dear Editor-in-Chief
This manuscript may be of interest to the Health Scope readers and the health community, but several points need to be addressed.
Editor comments
Which author/s conducted the interview?
What were the researcher's credentials? e.g., Ph.D., MD
What was the author/s occupation at the time of the study?
Was the researcher male or female?
What experience or training did the researcher have?
What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g., personal goals, reasons for doing the research
What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g., Bias, assumptions, reasons, and interests in the research topic
How were participants approached? e.g., face-to-face, telephone, mail, email
How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?
Where was the data collected? e.g., home, clinic, workplace
Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?
Were questions pilot-tested?
Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?
Did the research use audio or visual recordings to collect the data?
Were field notes made during and/or after the interview?
What was the duration of the interviews?
Should data saturation be discussed?
Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?
How many data coders coded the data?
The coding tree should describe.
Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?
Did participants provide feedback on the findings?
First Reviewer Comments
Dear author
please:
1- Abstract: Accuracy and robustness of information
2- Type of content analysis method
3- Help questions should be arranged in the form of a table
4- Information should be reported based on five Granium steps.
5- How to use it for information accuracy and robustness? reference?
6- Demographic table
7- In the second theme, it is suggested that the title be corrected to the lack of understanding of marital issues instead of marital distress.

8. Send a coded interview.

9- Research environment is not specified for coding? Software or Word?

10- Limited study implementation

11- The original codes extracted? How many codes have been reduced in the process of reviewing, comparing, and creating classes? To be added in the results section.

12- Title: Explanation of experiences .... be added

13- Reference 14-19-22-23 according to the structure of the journal

Second Review Comments

The file is attached

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (0) 6 Dec 2021

Dear Author

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 respected editor

Thank you very much for your timely response. The point-by-point answers to respected reviewers' comments are provided and sent to you as an attached file entitled "answers to reviewers comments". The required changes have been made in the manuscript text and marked in red. I look forward to hearing from you as soon as possible,

Best regards,

Respected reviewers' comments and related answers:

1- Abstract: Accuracy and robustness of information

In this study, Lincoln and Guba criteria were used to ensure the robustness of the study. This explanation was added to the abstract. Trustworthiness criteria are attached.

2- Type of content analysis method

In the present study, an inductive qualitative content analysis was used. In this approach, the organization phase includes open coding, creating categories, and abstraction. The key purpose of inductive analysis is to dig into what is happening in the data, to understand the themes present in the data, and to produce findings to answer research questions.

This explanation was added to the text.

3- Help questions should be arranged in the form of a table

The researcher started the interview with general questions and then the follow-up questions were asked according to the participants' answers and the study goal.

The question guide table is attached.

4- Information should be reported based on five Granheim steps.

As explained in the Methods section of the manuscript, in this study the five steps of Granheim and Lundman were performed. In the coding tree file which is attached, these steps are shown.

1. Transcribing the interview promptly at the end of each interview session

2. Reading carefully each interview several times to be assured of gaining a general perception of its content and identifying Meaning units

3. Abstracting meaning unit through line-by-line coding

4. Sorting codes with similar meanings into subcategories, combining subcategories depending on their relationships into a smaller number of categories.

5. Formulating themes following the revelation of deeper meanings in data

5- How to use it for information accuracy and robustness? reference?

we have chosen to use the original, widely accepted, and easily recognized criteria introduced by Lincoln and Guba (1985) to demonstrate trustworthiness in our study. This explanation was added to the text.

In this study external check was one of the techniques used for trustworthiness. The external researchers examined the coding process according to Lincoln and Guba criteria.

6- Demographic table

The demographic information table is attached.

7- In the second theme, it is suggested that the title be corrected to the lack of understanding of marital issues instead of marital distress.

The valuable opinion of the esteemed referee was applied.

8. Send a coded interview.

a coded interview is attached.

it is necessary to mention, this study was carried out as part of a Ph.D. thesis in nursing education.

9- Research environment is not specified for coding? Software or Word?

In this study, MAXQDA software was used for data analysis.

10- Limited study implementation

One of the challenges of this study was that the participants were in a critical moment in their lives. It was somewhat difficult to get women to participate in the study in these circumstances. Especially since sometimes the presence of spouses made the situation more difficult.

Another challenge the researcher faced was the reluctance of women to talk about issues in their lives with an unrelated person. The researcher tried to gain the trust of these women and sometimes their husbands by treating them with respect. As a result, some women mentioned that they shared things with the researcher that they had never talked about with anyone else.

Given that the researcher was able to overcome these challenges, it was not considered a limitation in the study. However, one of the limitations of qualitative research is its explanatory nature, the low number of participants, and the context-dependent findings, which limits the application of these findings to others.

11- The original codes extracted? How many codes have been reduced in the process of reviewing, comparing, and creating classes? To be added in the results section.

In total, 798 open codes were obtained, which were classified into 74 primary categories. As the analysis progressed, 15 subcategories, 5 main categories, and two themes were revealed.

This explanation was added to the text.

12- Title: Explanation of experiences .... be added

The valuable opinion of the esteemed referee was applied.

13- Reference 14-19-22-23 according to the structure of the journal

The valuable opinion of the esteemed referee was applied.

Associate Editor 1:

Dear Editor-in-Chief

This manuscript may be of interest to the Health Scope readers and the health community, but several points need to be addressed.

Editor comments

Which author/s conducted the interview?

The interview was conducted by the first author.

What were the researcher’s credentials? e.g., Ph.D., MD

The first author is a Ph.D. candidate and other authors have A Ph.D. degree.

What was the author/s occupation at the time of the study?

The first author was a student at the time of this study and has a history of qualitative studies. other writers were faculty members of the university and have a history of conducting and guiding qualitative studies in their resumes.

Was the researcher male or female?

The first author and corresponding author were female and the other researcher was male.

What experience or training did the researcher have?

The first author has a history of educational activities in the field of community health nursing and mental health nursing. She also has a history of supervising and advising master's dissertations in psychology in her resume. Other authors also have a long history in nursing education and conducting qualitative studies and supervising master's and doctoral dissertations in their resumes

.

What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g., personal goals, reasons for doing the research

The researcher introduced herself to the participants in terms of name and level of education. She also gave them her phone number so they could call her if needed. She explained to them that this study aims to understand the experiences of women on the verge of divorce. The researcher is interested in doing this study because it provides more knowledge for Community planners and can improve women's quality of life and Prevent family breakups.

What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g., Bias, assumptions, reasons, and interests in the research topic

The researcher tried to enter the research process without Prejudice and judgments. She tried to identify her assumptions and be careful not to interfere in the research process. She used the bracketing method.

Bracketing is a method used in qualitative research to mitigate the potentially deleterious effects of preconceptions that may taint the research process.

How were participants approached? e.g., face-to-face, telephone, mail, email

The researcher was present at the Divorce Injury Reduction center and Social Welfare Clinic. She talked to the eligible women in a face-to-face manner and invited them to participate in the study.

How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?

Fortunately, all the women who were invited to participate in the study, eagerly accepted.

Where was the data collected? e.g., home, clinic, workplace

Data were collected at the Divorce Injury Reduction Center and Social Welfare Clinic.

Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?

Interviews were conducted in a private room with only the presence of the researcher and participant.

Were questions pilot-tested?

Before starting the study, the researcher interviewed two eligible women to participate in the study to get more information on how to ask the interview questions correctly, assess the acceptability of an interview, modify interview questions, and enhance the credibility of a qualitative study. These interviews were not included in the analysis process.

Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?

Some of the participants were interviewed several times. The maximum number of interviews per person was three. A total of twenty-four interviews were conducted with seventeen interviewees.

Did the research use audio or visual recordings to collect the data?

Data collection was done through audio recording.

Were field notes made during and/or after the interview?

The researcher also used field notes in the research process.

What was the duration of the interviews?

As explained in the manuscript, The duration of interviews varied from 45 to 90 minutes. In total, 730 min of interviews were recorded.

Should data saturation be discussed?

Sampling and data collection continued until information redundancy was achieved, at this point, the new data did not create a new category and the existing categories also did not change.

Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?

As explained in the manuscript, The participants were contacted after the analysis and were given a full transcript of their respective coded interviews to determine whether the codes matched their experiences.

How many data coders coded the data?

In reality, the first author coded the interviews, and the coding process was overseen by two other authors. The first two interviews were also coded by one of the other researchers and the coding results were compared. There was an acceptable agreement.

The coding tree should describe.

The coding tree is attached.

Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?

This study was inductive content analysis. Therefore, themes were extracted from the data.

Did participants provide feedback on the findings?

To increase the validity of the study, the participants' feedback was reviewed by the researcher. Participants' feedback showed that the findings were consistent with their experiences.

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.

Maryam Seraji: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 25 Dec 2021

Dear Associate Editor
The comments are very well corrected and need to be corrected again
please:
1- In qualitative studies, we do not have data to be modified into information in the whole article.
2- Type of qualitative study: Qualitative is inductive and according to the 5 stages of Granium, type of content analysis: Content analysis is conventional to be modified in the whole article.
3- The table of accuracy and solidity of the information should be added to the text and the explanations should be deleted. Only the text should be added. Accuracy and accuracy of the information The criteria of validity, verifiability, reliability, and transferability were used. (Mentioning the reference)
4- All questions in the help questions table should have a question mark.
5- Demographic tables, guide questions and accuracy should be added to the text of the article.
6- Add in the abstract and text of the article, the information was saturated with 17 people and no new information was extracted.

Hassan Okati-Aliabad: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 13 Jan 2022

Dear Editor-in-Chief
The following points should be considered for the manuscript with id number 120007 to be acceptable for publication:
Editor comment:
The authors have responded to the editor's comments, but this response should be reflected in the manuscript text.
Reviewer comments:
1- In qualitative studies, we do not have data to be modified into information in the whole article.
2- Type of qualitative study: Qualitative is inductive and according to the 5 stages of Granium, type of content analysis: Content analysis is conventional to be modified in the whole article.
3- The table of accuracy and solidity of the information should be added to the text and the explanations should be deleted. Only the text should be added. Accuracy and accuracy of

the information The criteria of validity, verifiability, reliability, and transferability were used. (Mentioning the reference)

4- All questions in the help questions table should have a question mark.

5- Demographic tables, guide questions and accuracy should be added to the text of the article.

6- Add in the abstract and text of the article, the information was saturated with 17 people and no new information was extracted.

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision (1)** 27 Jan 2022

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 respected editor

Thank you very much for your timely response. The point-by-point answers to respected reviewers' comments are provided and sent to you as follows. The required changes have been made in the manuscript text and marked in blue. I look forward to hearing from you as soon as possible.

Best regards

1. In qualitative studies, we do not have data to be modified into information in the whole article.
   According to esteemed reviewers' comments, data was modified to information in the whole article. In lines 12-13-14-17-64-66-67-72-76-77-296

2. Type of qualitative study: Qualitative is inductive and according to the 5 stages of Granheim, type of content analysis: Content analysis is conventional to be modified in the whole article.
   According to esteemed reviewers' comments, the type and approach of the study were written in lines 9,10 in the method section of the abstract and line 57 in the design and sample section, and line 78 in the Information analysis section of the article.

3. The table of accuracy and solidity of the information should be added to the text and the explanations should be deleted. Only the text should be added. Accuracy and accuracy of the information the criteria of validity, verifiability, reliability, and transferability were used. (Mentioning the reference).
   According to esteemed reviewers' comments, the table of accuracy and solidity of the information was added to the text and the explanations have been deleted. The table3 was mentioned to be located in lines 85,86 and the table itself has been added at the end of the article in line 464. Only the below text in lines 85,86 was added and the reference was mentioned.
   "The Lincoln and Guba (1985) criteria of validity, confirmability, dependability, and transferability were used."

4. All questions in the help questions table should have a question mark.
   According to esteemed reviewers' comments, in table 2, line 462 question mark was used.

5. Demographic tables, guide questions and accuracy should be added to the text of the article.
   According to esteemed reviewers' comments, the Demographic table (table 1) was added in line 65. The interview guide table (table 2) was added in line 73 and the applied trustworthiness criteria table was added in line 86. All aforementioned tables can be seen at the end of the manuscript after the reference section (pages 21- 23).

6. Add in the abstract and text of the article, the information was saturated with 17 people, and no new information was extracted.
According to esteemed reviewers' comments, the Mentioned sentence was added to the abstract in lines 13,14 and the design and sample section of the article in line 64.

Regarding the queries mentioned in the screening results:

The blindness of Peer Review: FAILED
It is important to mention that the blindness was respected all over the file entitled "2nd revised manuscript file without title page" and also in Reply to Reviewers and Acknowledgment

Control of Revised Files: FAILED
We have replied to all reviewers' comments one by one with line numbers which can be found in the above sections in this file.

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.

Hassan Okati-Aliabad: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 8 Mar 2022

Dear editor in chief,
The manuscript entitled "Explanation of experiences of Iranian women on the verge of divorce regarding rationality" has been modified according to the reviewer's comments and is ready for the next step.
Kind regards

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (2) 8 Mar 2022

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