

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/healthscope-140256>

Published in: Health Scope: 13(1); e140256

Peer Review Report for "The Effect of an Educational Intervention Based on an Integrated Social Cognition Model on Waste Recycling at the Source Among Housewives in Lahijan City: A Quasi-Experimental Study"

Author(s): Marzieh Charkhtab Moghaddam, Isa Mohammadi Zeidi, Hadi Morshedi, Fatemeh Hosseini, Nooshin Rouhani-Tonekaboni

Review Timeline:

→/ Submit Date:	3 Sep 2023
→/ Revised Date:	10 Dec 2023
→/ Accepted Date:	28 Dec 2023

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)**

18 Sep 2023

Comments

This study focuses on The Effect of an Educational Intervention Based on the Integrated Social Cognition Model (ISCM) on Waste Recycling at Source among Housewives in Lahijan City: A Randomized Controlled Trial. I think the paper fits the scope of the journal well. However, a number of revisions are required before the paper can be considered for publication. There are some weak points that have to be strengthened. Below, please find more specific comments:

- In the abstract section, the background is not scientific.
- The methods in the abstract should be expanded. The sample size of this research is not enough for the results. What is the sampling method for participants in this study? Please refer to the validity of the questionnaires. Please indicate the duration of the intervention.

- The results are not clear. Please mention the p-value of the two groups before the intervention. The findings have been considered without significant statistical tests separately. How long after the intervention have the results been measured?
 - The keywords seem not to be appropriate. I would suggest writing one or two other relevant keywords as MESH format.
- In the introduction section, please apply the recent studies. The gap and the importance of the study should be identified clearly in this section. Please expand the model of this research. Please explain the reasons for using the model for this issue with reference to the previous studies. The relevant studies, including but not limited to the following:
1. Determinants of waste separation behavior Tabriz, Iran: An application of the theory of planned behavior at the health center. *Frontiers in Environmental Science*. Towhid Babazadeh et al. 2023. DOI: 10.3389/fenvs.2023.985095
- Please apply the World Health Organization website in the manuscript as a reference in terms of waste recycling.
- In the methods section, considering that the participants knew which group they were in (control/intervention), don't you think it would be a bias in the results of your study? What actions have been taken to reduce this bias? For ethical reasons, according to the Helsinki guidelines, what action was considered for the control group due to the deprivation of receiving educational intervention? Please mention the randomization method used in the study to select health centers and participants in the groups.
- Please, during the study and intervention, be explained.
 - In order for other authors to use your method in the intervention, please explain the intervention strategies for the model structures, including action planning, coping planning, perceived behavioral control, and self-efficacy.
 - The inclusion and exclusion criteria are not clear.
 - Was it possible for all women to use WhatsApp? Are illiterate women deprived of intervention?
 - The educational sessions are not mentioned in detail. It is very general. It is not known which structure was discussed in which session.
 - Considering the extent of the model, it is surprising that all the constructs of the model have been improved with six training sessions, despite that the educational program was conducted in virtual.
 - In the results section, please edit the tables and figures according to journal format.
 - Please avoid repeating the results both in the table and in the text.
 - In the discussion section, please compare the results and interpretations with recent studies in other countries and Iran. This discussion should be supported by recent and relevant studies with similar models, including but not limited to the following:
1. The effectiveness of an intervention designed based on health action process approach on diet and medication adherence among patients with type 2 diabetes: A randomized controlled trial. *Diabetology & Metabolic Syndrome*. Ranjbaran et al. 2022; 14(3).
 2. Using a health action process approach to determine diet adherence among patients with Type 2 diabetes. Ranjbaran et al. *Journal of Education and Health Promotion*. 2020, 9:170. DOI:10.4103/jehp.jehp_175_20
 3. Effects of Educational Interventions on Dietary Adherence among Type 2 Diabetics in Zahedan: Using the Health Action Process Approach. *Ethiop J Health Sci*. Moghimi S et al.

2023; 33(4):571. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/ejhs.v33i4.3>

- It is suggested that the discussion has been developed with the authors' own explanations and discussions in the context of other studies and the results of the present study and not just compare the results.
- The conclusions section should expand future research needs.
- Please mention the strengths of the study.
- The reference to this research is not sufficient for comparison and discussion.
- Please use a professional editing service to improve your writing style.

→ **Ramazan Mirzaei**: EIC | **Revision (0)**

26 Sep 2023

Dear Author

Thanks for submitting your valuable manuscript to the journal. As a result, we would like to inform you that the review of your manuscript is finished, and based on the editorial decision, you need to do a "Major Revision" on your manuscript. Even though this manuscript has enough quality to enter the review process, it needs some significant (major) revisions in some points of view.

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.

Manuscript ID: 140256

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for having given us the opportunity to respond to the reviewers' comments and revise our manuscript. We appreciate the encouraging comments of the editor and reviewers. Below are the reviewers' verbatim comments, our responses, and how and where we have modified the manuscript to address these comments. All changes in the manuscript have been highlighted. In our response to the reviewers, the comments of the reviewers are in italic, and our responses are in bold.

We hope that with these changes and clarifications, our manuscript will be acceptable for publication. Nevertheless, we are prepared to revise our manuscript further, should it be necessary.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

- In the abstract section, the background is not scientific.

Agreed. It was edited (page 1, lines 5-7)

- The methods in abstract should be expanded. The sample size of this research is not enough for results. What is the sampling method for participants in this study? Please refer to the validity of the questionnaires. Please indicate the duration of the intervention.

Agreed. It was edited (page 1, lines 10-20) and the research sample is estimated based on the sample size formula (page 3, lines 8-10)

- The results are not clear. Please mention the p-value of the two groups before the intervention. The findings have been considered without significant statistic tests separately. How long after the intervention have the results been measured?

Agreed. It was edited (page 1, lines 23 and 26-27)

- The keywords seem not to be appropriate. I would suggest writing one or two other relevant keywords as MESH format.

Agreed. It was edited (page 1, lines 31, 32)

- In the introduction section, please apply the recent studies. The gap and the importance of the

study should be identified clearly at this section. Please expand the model of this research. Please explain the reasons for using the model for this issue with reference to the previous studies. The relevant studies, including but not limited to the following:

1. Determinants of waste separation behavior Tabriz, Iran: An application of the theory of planned behavior at health center. Frontiers in Environmental Science. Towhid Babazadeh et al. 2023. DOI: 10.3389/fenvs.2023.985095

Agreed. It was edited (page 2, line 8 and lines 20-28) and reference 5.

- Please apply World Health Organization website in the manuscript as a reference in terms of waste recycling.

Agreed. It was edited (page 2, lines 4-7)

In the methods section, considering that the participants knew which group they were in (control/intervention), don't you think it would a bias in the results of your study? What actions have been taken to reduce this bias? For ethical reasons, according to the Helsinki guidelines, what action was considered for the control group due to the deprivation of receiving educational intervention? Please mention the randomization method used in the study to select health centers and participants in the groups.

- Please during the study and intervention is explained.

Response: agreed. It was edited (page 2, lines 34-41 and page 5, lines 14-19)

- In order for other authors to use your method in the intervention, please explain the intervention strategies for the model structures, including action planning, coping planning, perceived behavioral control, and self-efficacy.

Response: agreed. It was edited (page 4, lines 16-21 and page 5, lines 1-19)

-The inclusion and exclusion criteria are not clear.

Response: agreed. It was edited (page 3, lines 3-8)

- Was it possible for all women to use WhatsApp? Are illiterate women deprived of intervention?

Response: agreed. It was checked (page 3, line 4)

- *The educational session are not mentioned in detail. It is very general. It is not known which structure was discussed in which session.*

Response: agreed. It was edited (page 4, lines 16-21 and page 5, lines 1-19)

- *Considering the extent of the model, it is surprising that all the constructs of the model have been improved with six training sessions, despite that the educational program was conducted in virtual.*

Response: agreed. It was checked, in this study, the intervention model has been conducted on 6 structures, which are achievable and reasonable according to the conducted studies.

- *In the results section, please edit the tables and figure according to journal format.*

Response: agreed. It was edited (tables 1-4)

- *Please avoid repeating the results both in the table and in the text.*

Response: agreed. It was edited (page 7, lines 2-5)

- *In the discussion section, please compare the results and interpretations with recent studies in other countries and Iran. This discussion should be supported by the recent and relevant studies with the similar models, including but not limited to the following:*

1. *The effectiveness of an intervention designed based on health action process approach on diet and medication adherence among patients with type 2 diabetes: A randomized controlled trial. Diabetology & Metabolic Syndrome. Ranjbaran et al. 2022; 14(3).*
2. *Using health action process approach to determine diet adherence among patients with Type 2 diabetes. Ranjbaran et al. Journal of Education and Health Promotion. 2020, 9:170. DOI:10.4103/jehp.jehp_175_20*
3. *Effects of Educational Interventions on Dietary Adherence among Type 2 Diabetics in Zahedan: Using the Health Action Process Approach. Ethiop J Health Sci .Moghimi S et al. 2023; 33(4):571. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/ejhs.v33i4.3>*

Response: agreed. It was added (references 5, 35 and 39)

- *It is suggested that the discussion has been developed with the authors' own explanations and discussions in the context of other studies and the results of the present study and not just compare the results.*

Response: agreed. It was edited (discussion section)

- The conclusions section should expand future research needs.

Response: agreed. It was edited (page 10, lines 6 and 7)

- Please mention the strengths of the study.

Response: agreed. It was added (page 10, lines 11-13)

- The reference of this research is not sufficient for compare and discussion.

Agreed. It was edited (Updated and added references (

- Please using a professional editing service would improve the writing style.

Response: agreed. Translation and native editing has been done, but for more certainty, native editing will be done again by article-x.

Reviewer 2:

1- The validity and reliability of the questionnaire should be added in the abstract

Response: agreed. It was added (page 1, line 14-16)

2- In the introduction, the use of the model should be added in the latest waste recycling articles

Response: agreed. It was added

3- How are the centers selected based on urban and rural areas?

Response: agreed. It was checked, rural women were not included in this study.

4- Entry criteria for specialized studies

Agreed. It was edited (page 3, lines 3-8)

5- Is there a sample drop rate in the study? And considered in the sample size?

Response: agreed. It was edited, A 25% drop rate was considered, but the drop did not happen (page 3, line 10).

6- What was the educational strategy of each structure in the educational program?

Response: agreed. It was edited (page 4, lines 16-21 and page 5, lines 1-19)

7- Direct link to code of ethics

Response: agreed. It was added (page 5, line 31)

8- In the framework of writing the discussion, it seems that the reasons for each structure should be mentioned

Response: agreed. It was edited (discussion section)

9- The references should be based on the framework of the journal

Response: agreed. It was edited

Reviewer 3:

Please Explain completely about random sampling method. Is there a need to randomly select samples in this research?

Response: agreed. It was edited (page 2, lines 34-41)

Please Explain completely about random allocation method isn't there any lost to follow-up during the follow-up period?

Response: agreed. It was edited (page 2, lines 34-41)

Considering that there is no difference between the groups before the intervention, is there a need for covariance analysis?

Response: yes, analysis of covariance was used in this study to evaluate the effect of the intervention on the quantitative variable by controlling the effect of the confounding variable (evaluating the effect of the educational intervention on the amount of recycling by controlling the pre-test effect) for data analysis.

It is better to identify the constructs affecting the action in the intervention group using regression methods

Response: Yes, but in this manuscript, according to the goals, there was no need to perform the regression test.

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.

→ **Ramazan Mirzaei:** EIC | **Revision (1)**

23 Nov 2023

Dear Author

Thanks for submitting your valuable manuscript to the journal. As a result, we would like to inform you that the review of your manuscript is finished, and based on the editorial decision, you need to do a "Minor Revision" on your manuscript. Even though this manuscript has enough quality to enter the review process, it needs some significant (minor) revisions in some points of view.

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.

Manuscript ID: 140256

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for having given us the opportunity to respond to the reviewers' comments and revise our manuscript. We appreciate the encouraging comments of the Editor and reviewers. Below are the reviewers' verbatim comments, our responses, and how and where we have modified the manuscript to address these comments. All changes in the manuscript have been highlighted. In our response to the reviewers, the comments of the reviewers are in italics, and our responses are in bold.

We hope that with these changes and clarifications, our manuscript will be acceptable for publication. Nevertheless, we are prepared to revise our manuscript further, should it be necessary.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

- The authors have revised the manuscript based on the reviewers' comments

Response: Thank You

Reviewer 2:

Thanks for the corrections made to the manuscript. However, a number of revisions are required before the paper can be considered for publication. There are some weak points that have to be strengthened. Below, please find more specific comments:

- In the introduction section, please apply the recent and related studies to improve your work, including:

Using health action process approach to determine diet adherence among patients with Type 2 diabetes. Ranjbaran et al. Journal of Education and Health Promotion. 2020, 9:170. DOI:10.4103/jehp.jehp_175_20

Response: agreed. It was added (page 2, line 21)

- Please check all references. References 38 and 39 are not correctly cited on page 9, lines 24 to 26. Reference' 38 is for Moghimi, and reference' 39 is for the Ranjbaran.

Agreed. It was edited (page 9, lines 15-19)

- Please use a professional editing service to improve your writing style. There are still problems in the scientific and English writing of your manuscript instance "The results of the study by Ranjbaran et al. (38) and some other studies (references) showed the significance of coping self-efficacy after the intervention, having been consistent with our results (39)" is not scientific. When some other studies are mentioned in scientific writing, they should be referenced to more than one study, but you only used reference 39. The reference should be written after mentioning the study, not in unrelated text.

Agreed. It was edited and native edited (page 9, lines 15-19, Editing Certificate file attached)

Reviewer 3:

Thanks for the corrections made; the following items need to be corrected again please

- Please check the references; references 38-39 are not mentioned in the text.

Response: agreed. It was edited (page 9, lines 15-19)

- The text does not need native grammar editing

Response: agreed. It was natively edited (Editing Certificate file attached)

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)**

23 Dec 2023

Dear Editor of Chief,
This manuscript is acceptable.

→ **REFEREE:** EIC | **Revision (2)**

28 Dec 2023

Dear Authors,
The manuscript with ID: 140256 is accept.
Best,