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.55998
Published in: Health Scope: 9(1); e55998

Peer Review Report for "The Association of Mental Health with Family Relationships and High-Risk Behaviors in Female Students of South-Eastern Iran"

Author(s): Fariba Shahraki-Sanavi, Fatemeh Rakhshani, Alireza Ansari-Moghaddam, Mahdi Mohammadi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 23 Jun 2017
Revised Date: 16 Jun 2019
Accepted Date: 30 Sep 2019

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 2017

Dear AE,

1- The researchers should explain completely sample size determination and sampling method

2- The authors should specify clearly the method of measuring family relationships and High-Risk Behavior and also it would be better if the data regarding these variables were presented in a separate table

3- The Linear regression analysis to predict high-risk behaviors is not correct and the coefficients of other potential variables in the final model should be presented in this table

4- It is not clear how have the authors checked the assumptions for the linear regression model

5- If the authors have used Binary Logistic Regression between mental symptoms and other independent variables, so they should be specified that how to create a dichotomous variable for mental symptoms

Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision (0)** 29 Oct 2017

Dear AE,
The manuscript entitled Mental Health associated with family relationships and High-Risk Behavior in Female Student, South-Eastern Iran; reviewed and it has seemed that some changes are necessary following as
1- Some grammatical errors in the text are seen that must be corrected.
2- In Background the authors should be indicated the importance of the study by mentioning the previous study in these fields.
3- In material and method, the significant level of any statistical tests must be mentioned.
4- In material and method, the statistical tests that were used must be explained.
5- What criteria were used for the classification of the Mental subscales, it is better for more understanding there are explained.
Thank you

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision (0)** 23 Dec 2017

Dear AE,
The authors should revise the manuscript according to the comments, please
1- There are some typos and grammatical errors. Check the manuscript in native English.
2- Inclusion and exclusion criteria of the study be mentioned.
3- Describe the periods of recruitment and data collection.
4- Content validity ratio (CVR) and content validity index (CVI) for each question, is measured not for the whole questionnaire.
5- Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias.
6- Explain how the study size was arrived at.
7- Describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy.
8- Consider the use of a flow diagram.
9- Indicate the number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest.
10- Review the linear regression analysis report.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 23 Dec 2017

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)** 23 Dec 2017

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
Thanks.

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 Editor-In-Chief
Health Scope Journal
With many thanks to the Journal reviewers for their time and valuable comments. We have been highly appreciated and answered point by point as the following and can be seen in red color in the text.

Reviewer 1:

1- The researchers should explain completely about sample size determination and sampling method

Thanks, the following information was also added in study design.

Sample size was estimated based on the pilot study and the following formula with with P=0.2, d=0.04, α = 0.05.

$$n=\frac{pqz^2}{d^2}$$

Due to unisexuality in Iranian schools, first a list of girls' schools was prepared and four public high schools were selected randomly. Then all 10th grades students (n = 457) enrolled.

2- The authors should specify clearly the method of measuring for family relationships and High-Risk Behavior and also it would be better if the data regarding these variables presented in a separate table

Many thanks, the following information was now added in study design to fulfill your idea. And added high risk behavior in Table 2.

The second questionnaire included demographic (11 questions), and family connections (4 questions), and high-risk behavior questions (14 questions) contains: with content validity ratio (CVR) of 0.83, content validity index (CVI) of 0.90 and reliability (α) of 0.71 which examined the safety and violence behaviors during the month before the study, went out and leave house without notice, and investigates smoking, hookah, chewing tobacco, alcohol, drugs and sexual relations during student's life. The answers to multi-choice items, and the percentage of responses and mean score of health risk behaviors were calculated.

3- The Linear regression analysis to predict high-risk behaviors is not correct and the coefficients of other potential variables in the final model should be presented in this table

Thanks for suggestion, the coefficients of other potential variables in the final model presented in this table 4.

4- It is not clear that how have the authors checked the assumptions for linear regression model

Thanks again, we checked the assumptions of the regression test were investigated and then the method was used. Includes: the normality of the dependent variable, the average of the residual values closes to zero, the lack of correlation between the residual values and the predicted values, the lack of correlation between the residual values with the independent variables, the collinearity statistic, with a VIF value less than five, and a tolerance greater than 0.2, also Auto correlation also found that the Durbin-Watson value was between 1.5-2.5.

5- If the authors have used Binary Logistic Regression between mental symptom and other independent variables, so they should specified that how to create a dichotomous variable for mental symptoms

Thanks for your comments, the outcome variable for Binary Logistic Regression model was Mental Health disorder with two levels(low and mild, Moderate and sever) low and mild symptom was taken as reference levels.

Reviewer 2:

1- Some grammatical errors in text are seen that must be corrected.

Thanks, I reviewed and checked the text for English errors.

2- In Background the authors should be indicated the importance of the study by mention the previous study in these field.

Thanks, the following information was also added in background.

Furthermore, for girls, adolescence is the foundation of their future that guides the next stages throughout their lives and directly affects their future family and children. Then, investigating female adolescents' mental health status is essential because of their two-fold role within the health of community and impending generations' health. Therefore, due to the importance of adolescence in human life as a basis for present and future health, the present study was conducted to examine mental health associated with family relationships and high-risk behavior in female student, South-Eastern Iran. So logically, investigation of mental health problems and preventive measures, as well as early interventions, would lead to subsequent cost savings.

3- In material and method, significant level of any statistical tests must be mentioned.

Thanks for your suggestion, significant level in statistical tests was added in material and method.

4- In material and method, the statistical tests that were used must be explained.

Thanks again for your suggestion the following information was added in material and method.

Descriptive statistics were used to report the findings and the data were reported in terms of mean and standard deviation or frequency and percentage. In order to Binary Regression, and liner regression test was used and values less than 0.05 were considered as significant levels.

5- What criteria was used for classification the Mental subscales; it is better for more understanding there are explained.

Thanks for your accuracy, this is a standard questionnaire and subscales based on the cut-off line for scores in each subscale, were categorized into four categories.

Reviewer 3:

1- There are some typos and grammatical errors. Check the manuscript by native English.

Thanks, I reviewed and checked the text for English errors.

2- Inclusion and exclusion criteria of the study be mentioned.

Thanks, the following information was also added in method.

The subjects were recruited with respect to the ethical codes approved by ethical committee of Zahedan University of Medical Sciences (17.10.2015 and approval code IR.ZAUMS.REC.1394.251. In order to collect information, firstly, research method, questionnaire filling method, cooperation attracting, trusting and ensuring the confidentiality of responses was explained to the participants. A code was assigned to each subject for the confidentiality of the information. All 10th-grade students attending school were enrolled in the study, and only one of student excluded from the study that who was not satisfied.

3- Describe the periods of recruitment and data collection.

Thanks, we collected data in 2015(October-November).

4- Content validity ratio (CVR) and content validity index (CVI) for each question, they are measured not for the whole questionnaire.

Many thanks, we edited this error.

The questionnaire with adequate validity ratio (CVR), content validity index (CVI) and reliability (α) of 0.71.

5- Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias.

Thanks again for your comment the following information was added in limitation.

Potential bias: Students participated in this study were limited to the public schools and grade 10, and girls, therefore, are not representative of all adolescents in this age group. Missing value were only 2% of the participants for each variable of interest. In addition, the data collected are based on a self-administered questionnaire and there was no question about their identification.

6- Explain how the study size was arrived at.

Thanks, the following information was also added in study design.

Sample size was estimated based on the pilot study and the following formula with P=0.2, d=0.04, α = 0.05.

$$n=\frac{pqz^2}{d^2}$$

Due to unisexuality in Iranian schools, first a list of girls' schools was prepared and four public high schools were selected randomly. Then all 10th grades students (n = 457) enrolled.

7- Describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy.

Thanks again, Sample size was estimated based on the pilot study.

8- Consider use of a flow diagram.

The present study was descriptive and all individuals were enrolled in the study, so it is not need to provide a flowchart diagram.

9- Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest.

Thanks again for your suggestion the following information was added in limitation.

Missing value were only 2% of the participants for each variable of interest.

10- Review the linear regression analysis report.

Thanks for suggestion, the linear regression analysis reviewed and the coefficients of other potential variables in the final model presented in table 4.

Kind Regards

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 14 Sep 2018

Dear EIC,
The manuscript entitled "Mental Health associated with family relationships and High-Risk Behavior in Female Student, South-Eastern Iran" has been modified according to the reviewers' comments and is ready for the next step.
Kind regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 14 Sep 2018

Dear Authors,
Word Count Standards Checking:
[Manuscript Files: Not OK]
If your manuscript does not follow the journal's standards, please make it as standard according to the journal terms and the below Instructions.
- Word Counts
We have detected the maximum allowed word count in your manuscript was not in line with the journal standards. For example, the maximum allowable word count in a Research article must be 3500 words while in your manuscript is 4927 Please modify/correct/change the text of your manuscript and try not to reach the maximum word count, to read more about word counts click here.
Thanks.

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 Editor-In-Chief
Health Scope Journal
With many thanks to the Journal reviewers
We have been modified the manuscript and dropped the word count to 3500.

Kind Regards

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) 26 Nov 2018

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1- The tables should be presented uniformly. For example, The numbers should be brought along with the percents in Table 1. Also, the confidence intervals should be calculated for table 2 and mean and SD for total Mental Health scores in table 1
2- Table 3 should be revised and the exact P values are presented in this table.
3- The explanations for the results of table 3 are not clear and enough.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 27 Dec 2018

Dear EIC,
The manuscript entitled "Mental Health associated with family relationships and High-Risk Behavior in Female Student, South-Eastern Iran" has been modified according to the reviewers' comments and is ready for the next step.
Kind regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 1 Jan 2019

Dear Authors,
The tables should be presented uniformly. For example, The numbers should be brought alo1ng with the percents in Table 1. Also, the confidence intervals should be calculated for table 2 and mean and SD for total Mental Health scores in table 1
2- Table 3 should be revised and the exact P values are presented in this table.
3- The explanations for the results of table 3 are not clear and enough.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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 Editor-In-Chief
Health Scope Journal

With many thanks to the Journal reviewers for their time and valuable comments, we have accepted all the comments. We have been highly appreciated and answered point by point as the following and can be seen in red color in the main text.

1-The tables should be presented uniformly. For example The numbers should be brought along with the percents in Table 1. Also the confidence intervals should be calculated for table 2 and mean and SD for total Mental Health scores in table 1

Thanks. The format of both tables was identical, and in Table 1, the frequency and percentage were mentioned. The mean and standard deviation of the total score related to both tables were added to the text and removed from the tables.

2-the table 3 should be revised and exact P values presented in this table.

Many thanks. The exact P values are given in Table 3 .

3-The explanations for the results of table 3 is not clear and enough.

With many thanks, the explanations for the results of table 3 has been modified according to your suggestion.

Regards.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (3) 14 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (3) 29 Sep 2019

Dear EIC,
The manuscript entitled "Mental Health associated with family relationships and High-Risk Behavior in Female Student, South-Eastern Iran" has been modified according to the reviewer's comments and is ready for the next step.
Kind regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (3) 30 Sep 2019

Dear author
The final decision for this manuscript is “Accept”.
Best regards