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

International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijem.74356
Published in: International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism: 18(2); e74356

Peer Review Report for "Factors Related to Behavioral Functioning in Mothers of Children with Type 1 Diabetes: Application of Transactional Model of Stress and Coping"

Author(s): Mounes Asadi Shavaki, Tayebeh Fasihi Harandy, Mitra Rahimzadeh, Ata Pourabbasi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 6 May 2018
Revised Date: 17 Dec 2019
Accepted Date: 1 Feb 2020

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) — 9 Jul 2018

Dear AE,
The author should provide a comprehensive introduction on the main concepts and their relationship and the gap
Also, a big question is why in this study a high volume of the article has been given to the report on building the tool
- The tool is not done factor analysis so the validity of the structures are questioned
- The discussion should provide more information about the gap the researchers solved
My comments are included in the attached file.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 1 Sep 2018

Dear AE,
Regarding this manuscript study type, I can not do a comprehensive critical appraisal.

However, some points should be addressed:
1) Background: This section can be summarized with a focus on the most relevant issues. I think the reference to the last sentence of 1st paragraph is incorrect.
2) Methods: There is no statement regarding the informed consent of study participants. The developed questionnaire should be attached as a supplementary file and the 5th paragraph be summarized.
3) Results: Methods used for statistical analyses should not be mentioned in this section (...independent t-test,...ANOVA...); these items should be explained and clarified in the section on statistical analysis.
4) Discussion: Limitations of the study should be moved to the last paragraph of the discussion before the conclusions; moreover, there is no data regarding the unwillingness of some mothers to respond....in the section Results.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 19 Sep 2018

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
General issues:
1- As long as you can, don't use the word "diabetic". It looks like a kind of sticker for people. For example the sentence "mothers of diabetic children" could be change to "mothers of children with diabetes".
2- English writing of manuscript should be edited.
3- Is any difference between your research and mentioned works below?
a. Sweenie R, Mackey ER, Streisand R. Parent–child relationships in Type 1 diabetes: Associations among child behavior, parenting behavior, and pediatric parenting stress. Families, Systems, & Health. 2014 Mar;32(1):31.
b. Whittemore R, Jaser S, Guo J, Grey M. A conceptual model of childhood adaptation to type 1 diabetes. Nursing outlook. 2010 Sep 1;58(5):242-51..
4- References must be included in modified Vancouver style and use Endnote to manage them.
Methods:
5- Insert the reference for the process of validation of questionnaires. For example you said that the cut-point of "greater than 1.5" is essential for impact score!!! Also, in other sentence, you said that use Lawshe's table for the CVR validation methods. According to which references?
6- For test-retest method intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) should be calculate. Minimum and maximum value of item ICCs and mean value of ICCs must be reported for each construct.
7- Cronbach's alpha should be reported for each construct separately. The name of construct, including items and reliability coefficient (Alpha) must be reported for each construct. You could report these results in the table framework.
8- Why you used 180 cases in this study? Please describe sampling method and sample size calculation method? Morgan table utilized for prevalence study. Which variable was the main factor in sampling and sample size determination?
9- In the statistical analysis you should notice the assumptions of ANOVA, regression or T-

test and their alternative methods if they are not applicable.
10- It seems that your sample is not representative of the Iranian, even Tehranian, population (especially according to parental education and income). You could use the more diabetes intervention centers or clinics. Also, your sampling method could be leading selection bias.
Results:
11- In Table 1 insert the full name of variables (instead of numbers) in row (or column).
12- For describing correlation results report the correlation coefficient in the text (r=?, p=?).
13- You could report demographic and parental basic characteristics in separate table which includes the Mean (SD) or frequency (%) values.
14- The results of mean comparison (T-test or ANOVA) should be reported in separate table that Includes the mean and SD (or median and IQR) for variables across compared groups.
15- In table 2 report the beta (95% confidence interval) and p-value for each evaluation. All of tables should be in scientific framework.
16- In table 2 identify the reference group for mother's education. Also, report the excluded variables from the model step-by-step.
17- Did you check the assumptions of regression analysis including: error variance consistency, residuals normality and collinearity among predictors?
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 24 Sep 2018

Dear EIC,
The review process of the manuscript has been finalized. Based on the reviewers' comments and my own decision the current version of the manuscript needs a "MAJOR REVISION". All the comments and suggestions are attached.
The best

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 25 Sep 2018

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.

Response Letter

Dear reviewers;

Thank you very much for your valuable comments. The considered corrections were made as follows:

Reviewer 1:

- **The author should provide a comprehensive introduction on the main concepts and their relationship and the gap**

This section was edited.

- **Also a big question is that why in this study a high volume of the article has given to the report of building the tool**

Because according to the transactional model of stress and coping, there was no scale for mothers of children with type 1 diabetes, and our study is in fact a model test. For this reason, the design and tool manufacturing steps have been described in the methodology section.

- **The tool is not done factor analysis so the validity of the structures are questioned**

The factor analysis is also conducted, but due to the increase in the volume of the paper, the report will be presented in another article based on the opinion of the research team.

- **The discussion should provide more information about the gap the researchers solved**

This section was edited.

Reviewer 2:

- **As long as you can, don’t use the word "diabetic". It looks like a kind of sticker for people. For example the sentence “mothers of diabetic children” could be change to “mothers of children with diabetes”.**

This section was edited.

- **English writing of manuscript should be edited.**

The paper was edited.

- **Is any difference between your research and mentioned works below?**
  a. Sweenie R, Mackey ER, Streisand R. Parent–child relationships in Type 1 diabetes: Associations among child behavior, parenting behavior, and pediatric parenting stress. Families, Systems, & Health. 2014 Mar; 32(1):31.
  b. Whittemore R, Jaser S, Guo J, Grey M. A conceptual model of childhood adaptation to type 1 diabetes. Nursing outlook. 2010 Sep 1; 58(5):242-51.

In the first article, factors such as social support and optimism have not been investigated. In the second article, the coping of children with diabetes has been studied that several studies have been done about them.

But in our study, mothers' coping and behaviors are investigated based on a suitable model.

- **References must be included in modified Vancouver style and use Endnote to manage them.**

This section was edited.

Methods:

- **Insert the reference for the process of validation of questionnaires. For example you said that the cut-point of "greater than 1.5" is essential for impact score!!! Also, in other sentence, you said that use Lawshe's table for the CVR validation methods. According to which references?**

References were added.

- **For test-retest method intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) should be calculate. Minimum and maximum value of item ICCs and mean value of ICCs must be reported for each construct.**

This section were added.

- **Cronbach's alpha should be reported for each construct separately. The name of construct, including items and reliability coefficient (Alpha) must be reported for each construct. You could report these results in the table framework.**

This section were added.

- **Why you used 180 cases in this study? Please describe sampling method and sample size calculation method? Morgan table utilized for prevalence study. Which variable was the main factor in sampling and sample size determination?**

This section were added.

- **In the statistical analysis you should notice the assumptions of ANOVA, regression or T-test and their alternative methods if they are not applicable.**

In this study, all the assumptions of the tests were reviewed and approved by the statistician before they were performed.

- **It seems that your sample is not representative of the Iranian, even Tehranian, population (especially according to parental education and income). You could use the more diabetes intervention centers or clinics. Also, your sampling method could be leading selection bias.**

Since the number of mothers of children with type 1 diabetes was low and access to them, as well as their cooperation for participating in the study was low, we had to select sample from 3 different centers through available (convenience) sampling procedure. We have also mentioned this as part of the study's limitations. In this study, the effects of education and income on model structures were investigated and the results have been presented in the paper.

Results:

- **In Table 1 insert the full name of variables (instead of numbers) in row (or column).**

This section were added.

- **For describing correlation results report the correlation coefficient in the text (r=?, p=?).**

This section were added.

- **You could report demographic and parental basic characteristics in separate table which includes the Mean (SD) or frequency (%) values.**

This section were added.

- **The results of mean comparison (T-test or ANOVA) should be reported in separate table that Includes the mean and SD (or median and IQR) for variables across compared groups.**

Since the number of demographic variables and the number of model structures in this study were high, writing the results of all tests in the table was very massive, therefore, we wrote only significant relationships (along with mean and significance levels) in the paper.

In table 2 report the beta (95% confidence interval) and p-value for each evaluation. All of tables should be in scientific framework.

This section were added.

- **In table 2 identify the reference group for mother’s education. Also, report the excluded variables from model step-by-step.**

In the regression model, maternal education in the first step, optimism in the second step, emotion-focused coping in the third step, social support in the fourth step, information seeking in the fifth step and the initial assessment in the final step were introduced into the regression model.

The education level of under-diploma was the reference group.

- **Did you check the assumptions of regression analysis including: error variance consistency, residuals normality and collinearity among predictors?**

For all statistical tests as well as for the regression model, all necessary assumptions were reviewed and approved.

Reviewer 3:

- **Background: This section can be summarized with focus on most relevant issues. I think the reference of the last sentence of 1st paragraph is incorrect.**

This section was edited.

- **Methods: There is no statement regarding the informed consent of study participants. The developed questionnaire should be attached as a supplementary file and the 5th paragraph be summarized.**

This section was edited.

- **Results: Methods used for statistical analyses should not be mentioned in this section (...independent t test,...ANOVA...); these items should be explained and clarified in the section of statistical analysis.**

The names of the statistical tests have been written in the (statistical analysis) section. But due to the large variety of variables and differences in the type of test, only the tests that showed significant relationship were written in the results section. However, if the reviewer's opinion is to remove them from the results section, this will be done.

- **Discussion: Limitations of the study should be moved to the last paragraph of discussion before the conclusions; moreover, there is no data regarding unwillingness of some mothers to respond....in the section of Results.**

Limitations were moved to the end of the discussion.

A number of mothers did not tend to answer the questions, and this limitation led to prolonged sampling higher than the expected time. But it did not affect the results of the study.

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) 28 Nov 2018

Dear AE,
Unfortunately, I have not been satisfied with regards to the authors' answers. Also, none of the revisions according to my comments (Reviewer 3) have an appropriate page and/or paragraph referring.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 17 Dec 2018

Dear AE,
New minor revisions for the manuscript entitled “Factors Related to Behavioral Functioning in Mothers of Children with Type 1 Diabetes: Application of Transactional Model of Stress and Coping”:
Comments for the authors:
1. Table 4 should be edited such as tables presented in scientific documents. The three needful columns which should be reported includes: B, 95%CI and p-values.
2. The sentence about removing non-significant variables in stepwise process, as follows, could be added in the text:
“In the regression model, maternal education in the first step, optimism in the second step, emotion-focused coping in the third step, social support in the fourth step, information seeking in the fifth step and the initial assessment in the final step were introduced into the regression model.”
3. In comparing mean score of behavior among social-demographic variables, since the mean ± SD of the behavior score have not been reported in the groups, either report this information in full in the appendix, or at least for significant variables, as explained in the text, instead of the mean (alone), mean ± SD should be reported.
4. Also, statistical test should be deleted from results of mean comparison and correlations. for example:
The mean total score of behavior was significantly higher among working mothers than housewife mothers (41.25 ± SD vs. 34.85 ± SD, P = 0.013).
The interval between parents’ marriage and childbirth had a significant negative correlation with mother’s behavior (r =0/154, P =0.039).
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (1)** 14 Jan 2019

Dear EIC,
Based on the reviewers' comments and my own opinion, the manuscript needs a MAJOR REVISION. All comments, in particular, those which are expressed by the third referee need to be carefully addressed.
Sincerely yours

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (1)** 14 Jan 2019

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

Response Letter

Dear reviewers;

Thank you very much for your valuable comments. The considered corrections were made as follows:

We considered carefully all of the requested modifications that were mentioned by the all reviewers.

Due to the reviewers' suggestion and because of the word limit, we add table (3, 4, 5) in the supplementary section.

Reviewer 1:

1. *Table 4 should be edited such as tables presented in scientific documents. The three needful columns which should be reported includes: B, 95%CI and p-values.*

- *Its label has been changed to table 2 and modified.*

2. *The sentence about removing non-significant variables in stepwise process, as follows, could be added in the text:*
"In the regression model, maternal education in the first step, optimism in the second step, emotion-focused coping in the third step, social support in the fourth step, information seeking in the fifth step and the initial assessment in the final step were introduced into the regression model."

- To examine the predictors of mothers' behavior as coping outcomes, variables which had a significant relationship (mother's job, the interval between parents' marriage until child's birth, mother and father's educational level, mother's field of study, and model constructs), were introduced into the regression model step by step. In the regression model, maternal education in the first step, in the second step emotional regulation, in the third step social support, in the fourth step seeking information and primary appraisal in the final step were introduced into the regression model.

3. *In comparing mean score of behavior among social-demographic variables, since the mean ± SD of the behavior score have not been reported in the groups, either report this information in full in the appendix, or at least for significant variables, as explained in the text, instead of the mean (alone), mean ± SD should be reported.*

- *The mean ± SD have been added and highlighted changes. (The frist paragraph of page 5).*

4. Also, statistical test should be deleted from results of mean comparison and correlations. For example:
The mean total score of behavior was significantly higher among working mothers than housewife mothers (41.25 ± SD vs. 34.85 ± SD, P = 0.013).
The interval between parents' marriage and the child birth had a significant negative correlation with mother's behavior (r =0/154, P =0.039).

- *Statistical test have been deleted from results of mean comparison and correlations, And highlighted changes.*

Reviewer 2:

As long as you can, don't use the word "diabetic". It looks like a kind of sticker for people. For example the sentence "mothers of diabetic children" could be change to "mothers of children with diabetes".

- *This section has been edited.*
- *Following your recommendation we edited the paper and its native certification is attached.*

Is any difference between your research and mentioned works below?

a. Sweenie R, Mackey ER, Streisand R. Parent–child relationships in Type 1 diabetes: Associations among child behavior, parenting behavior, and pediatric parenting stress. Families, Systems, & Health. 2014 Mar; 32(1):31.
b. Whittemore R, Jaser S, Guo J, Grey M. A conceptual model of childhood adaptation to type 1 diabetes. Nursing outlook. 2010 Sep 1; 58(5):242-51.

- *In the first article, factors such as social support and optimism have not been investigated. In the second article, the coping of children with diabetes has been studied that several studies have been done about them.*
- *But in our study, mothers' coping and behaviors are investigated based on "Transactional Model of Stress and Coping".*

References must be included in modified Vancouver style and use Endnote to manage them.

- These sections have been edited. We used Vancouver style and EndNote to manage our references.

Methods:

Insert the reference for the process of validation of questionnaires. For example you said that the cut-point of "greater than 1.5" is essential for impact score!!! Also, in other sentence, you said that use Lawshe's table for the CVR validation methods. According to which references?

- The references have been added (Ref:12 ,13).

For test-retest method intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) should be calculate. Minimum and maximum value of item ICCs and mean value of ICCs must be reported for each construct.

- The recommended section has been added. (page 3 paragraph3)

Why you used 180 cases in this study? Please describe sampling method and sample size calculation method? Morgan table utilized for prevalence study. Which variable was the main factor in sampling and sample size determination?

- The recommended section has been added. Using the G Power Soft Ware with the 99% confidence and 90% power to achieve 20% for R-square and 20 of covariates for predicting the dependent variable (mothers' behaviors), 175 samples were required to conduct the study

In the statistical analysis you should notice the assumptions of ANOVA, regression or T-test and their alternative methods if they are not applicable.

- In this study, all the assumptions of the tests were reviewed and approved by the statistician before they were performed.

It seems that your sample is not representative of the Iranian, even Tehranian, population (especially according to parental education and income). You could use the more diabetes intervention centers or clinics. Also, your sampling method could be leading selection bias.

- *Since the number of mothers of children with type 1 diabetes was low and access to them, as well as their cooperation for participating in the study was low, we had to*

select sample from 2 different centers through available (convenience) sampling procedure. We have also mentioned this as part of the study's limitations. In this study, the effects of education and income on model structures were investigated and the results have been presented in the paper.

Results:

In Table 1 insert the full name of variables (instead of numbers) in row (or column).

- *The recommended section has been added.*

For describing correlation results report the correlation coefficient in the text (r=?, p=?).

- *The Values of R and P have been inserted in the Table 1.*

You could report demographic and parental basic characteristics in separate

The demographic information has been reported in the results and table 4 in supplementary file.

The results of mean comparison (T-test or ANOVA) should be reported in separate table that Includes the mean and SD (or median and IQR) for variables across compared groups.

In table 1 report the beta (95% confidence interval) and p-value for each evaluation. All of tables should be in scientific framework.

- *The recommended section has been added.*

In table 2 identify the reference group for mother's education. Also, report the excluded variables from model step-by-step.

- *The recommended section has been edited. In the first paragraph of page 7, have been inserted the included variables, so all other variables was not significant and have been excluded from model.*

Did you check the assumptions of regression analysis including: error variance consistency, residuals normality and collinearity among predictors?

- *For all statistical tests as well as for the regression model, all necessary assumptions were reviewed and approved.*
- *The Condition Index was calculated and there is weak collinearity among predictors. (paragraph 3, page 5)*

Reviewer 3:

Background: This section can be summarized with focus on most relevant issues. I think the reference of the last sentence of 1st paragraph is incorrect.

- *The recommended section has been modified.*.

Methods: There is no statement regarding the informed consent of study participants. The developed questionnaire should be attached as a supplementary file and the 5th paragraph be summarized.

- *The recommended section has been added.*

Results: Methods used for statistical analyses should not be mentioned in this section (...independent t test,...ANOVA...); these items should be explained and clarified in the section of statistical analysis.

- *Due to the reviewers' opinion, we removed the names of the statistical tests in the statistical analysis section.*

Discussion: Limitations of the study should be moved to the last paragraph of discussion before the conclusions; moreover, there is no data regarding unwillingness of some mothers to respond....in the section of Results.

- *We corrected the place of the study limitation and moved that to the end of the discussion.*

Best regard

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) 12 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors,
- The abstract does not contain technical and specialized points in the method and results sections. It is necessary to report in the abstract the methods of analysis with the most important quantitative results.
- How many expert opinions have been used in evaluating CVR & CVI?
- Results of CVR & CVI were not reported.
- Due to the structured questionnaire, it is recommended to check the construct validity
- What was the criterion for calculating the sample size with the G Power software? (In other words, what is the basis of the statistical test?)
- The information provided in the following sentence is ambiguous in determining the sample size:
“Using the G Power Soft Ware with the 99% confidence and 90% power to achieve 20% for R square
and 0.2 of covariates for predicting the dependent variable (mothers’ behaviors), 175 samples were required to conduct the study".
- Please double-check the sample size calculation method and get the result with further explanation.explanation.
- The explanations are not sufficient to justify matching the study subject to the model in question
- Why HPLPII was used in this study. Justify the relevance of HPLPII to the model and the topic
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 24 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
The authors have revised the manuscript according to my comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 4 Dec 2019

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** (2) 4 Dec 2019

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

Response Letter

Dear reviewers;

Thank you very much for your valuable comments. The considered corrections were made as follows:

We considered carefully all of the requested modifications that were mentioned by the all reviewers.

Reviewer 2

-The abstract does not contain technical and specialized points in the method and results sections. It is necessary to report in the abstract the methods of analysis with the most important quantitative results.

The abstract, methods of analysis and results have been edited.

- How many expert opinions have been used in evaluating CVR & CVI?
- Results of CVR & CVI were not reported.

-Has been edited

The Content Validity Index (CVI) and Content Validity Rate (CVR) were used in the quantitative method of assessing the content validity. To assess CVR, the questionnaire and a checklist were given to 10 expert faulty member and they were asked to score each item based on a three-point Likert scale (necessary, useful but not necessary, and not necessary). According to the Lawshe's table, to determine the minimum CVR value, a CVR of > 0.62 was recorded (12, 13).

- Due to the structured questionnaire, it is recommended to check the construct validity.

For evaluating construct validity, we have done factor analysis. It will publish in another article.

- What was the criterion for calculating the sample size with the G Power software? (In other words, what is the basis of the statistical test?)
- The information provided in the following sentence is ambiguous in determining the sample size:
"Using the G Power Soft Ware with the 99% confidence and 90% power to achieve 20% for R square and 0.2 of covariates for predicting the dependent variable (mothers' behaviors), 175 samples were required to conduct the study".

Has been edited

Using G Power Soft Ware of 99% confidence and 90% power to reach 20% for R-square and 20 independent variables for predicting the dependent variable (mothers' behaviors) in the linear regression method, 175 samples were required to conduct the study.

-The explanations are not sufficient to justify matching the study subject to the model in question

- Why HPLPII was used in this study. Justify the relevance of HPLPII to the model and the topic.

We used the HPLPII scale, Walker et al. (1987). This scale has 6 dimensions and Consists of six subscales to measure major aspects of a health promoting behaviors, including health responsibility, physical activity, nutrition, interpersonal relations, spiritual growth, and stress management. It has been widely translated and used to measure health-promoting behavior in different study population.

Best regard

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) 13 Jan 2020

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) 28 Jan 2020

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (3) 1 Feb 2020

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.