OPEN PEER REVIEW

Open Peer Review (OPR)

As a new feature for progressing towards transparency, we decided to open a new window for all of our editors as well as authors titled "**Open Peer Review**". We hope by this new facility, our reviewers will be more motivated and authors will be more satisfied with the review process. We believe that publishing our peer review reports could make a transparent and clear environment for all our efforts within a journal, but not all reviewers tend to publish their comments.

What is "Open Peer Review" process?

An "Open Peer Review" process is making the details of all review process (including reviewers, associate editors, and EICs comments) as "Public" as it is agreed by EIC, Authors, and reviewers.

Advantages of "Open Peer Review" process

- More transparency, constructiveness and tactful comments of the peer review process: leads to an increase in the quality of reviews
- More motivations for all involved roles in the review process
- Authors' satisfactions from the review process: Increases honesty between authors and reviewers
- Education of both authors and new students
- Prevents reviewers from following their individual agendas and leading to the detection of reviewers' conflicts of interests

You can find out more at:
https://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijhrba.101501
Published in: International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction: 9(4); e101501

Peer Review Report for "The Relationship Between Attachment Style and Social Network Addiction with the Mediating Role of Personality Traits"

Author(s): Maisam Shafiee, Ahmad Ashouri, Mahmood Dehghani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 3 Feb 2020
Revised Date: 20 Sep 2020
Accepted Date: 27 Sep 2020

Revision (0)

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

reza bidaki: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 29 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
- In the abstract section, The results are incomplete.
- Please prominent inclusion and exclusion criteria.
- The grammatical errors are noticeable.
- Please delete tables 3, 5 and insert data in context.
- Please design the manuscript in journal format.
- Please design the tables left to the right side.
- The final conclusion is loss.

Consider foot note include conflict of interest, funding and Acknowledgement end of manuscript.
Please update references. The references are old.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 29 Feb 2020

Dear EIC,
Thanks for this research

Comments for the authors:
- In abstract section, The results is incomplete.
- Please prominent inclusion and exclusion criteria.
- The grammatical errors are noticeable.
- Please delete tables 3, 5 and insert data in context.
- Please design the manuscript as journal format.
- Please design the tables left to right side.
- The final conclusion is a loss.

Consider foot note include conflict of interest, funding and Acknowledgement end of the manuscript.
Please update the references. The references are old.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 27 Apr 2020

Dear EIC,
The primary content is better to remove and explain more about virtual addiction and personality traits.
The authors should:
Explain the method of analysis in the abstract and method.
Summarize most of the results in the text. The tables are clear.
Discuss more about the last hypothesis, It is important
Add newer references.
regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 27 Apr 2020

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
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.

Reviewers' Comments (also *Associate Editor 1*)**:**

Reviewer 1:

Q: *In abstract section, The results is incomplete*.
R: The findings of this study are all put in here,

Also statistical indicators were added in the results section.

Q: *Please prominent inclusion and exclusion criteria*.
R: Inclusion and exclusion criteria added to manuscript.

Q: *The grammatical errors are noticeable*.
R: The Manuscript was completely reviewed, and with the help of a person who is fluent in English, it was tried to rectify its *grammatical errors*.

Q: Please delete table 3, 5 and insert data in context.

R: The mentioned changes were applied.

Q: Please design manuscript as journal format.
R: According to the instructions of the journal, the "Research Article" format was selected and the article was written in that format.

Q: Please design the tables left to right side.

R: The mentioned changes were applied.

Q: The final conclusion is loss.

R: An attempt was made to provide a better explanation of the final conclusion by providing further interpretation.

Q: Consider foot note include conflict of interest, funding and Acknowledgement end of manuscript.

R: The mentioned items were applied.

Q: Please update references. The references are old.

R: A number of new references were added or updated.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 2:
Q: The primary content is better to remove and explain more about virtual addiction and personality traits.

R: Part of the primary content removed and more explanation about virtual addiction was provided, but author thinks that further explanation about social network addiction is more valuable than virtual addiction, because social network addiction used in Title of Article.

Also because personality traits were measured by the Temperament and Character inventory (TCI), more explanation was provided about these concepts.

Q: Explain the method of analysis in the abstract and method.
R: the method of analysis explained.

Q: Summarize most of the results in the text. The tables are clear.
R: The mentioned changes were applied.

Q: Discuss more about the last hypothesis, It is important.
R: Efforts have been made to provide further explanations for the last hypothesis.

Q: Add newer references.

R: A number of new references were added or updated.

.Point: Also the email of the correspond author was changed to his academic email

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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 19 Sep 2020

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
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.

Reviewers' Comments

Q1: MAQ dimensions and attachment styles in METHODS were not described, but, in RESULTS we see these dimensions! (worry-ambivalent, disorganize-ambivalent, …)

R: MAQ includes 4 dimensions of secure, avoidant, worry-ambivalent and disorganize-ambivalent attachment styles, all of which were placed in the methods.

Q2: Why the authors have eliminated some questionnaires! Although, they have described, but it is not acceptable. There are some methods which they could use to avoid incomplete questionnaires:

a. They could follow the participant just after his/her answering

b. They could employ imputation methods.

R: As explained in the text, 261 questionnaires were collected out of 300 distributed questionnaires, which means that 39 questionnaires were lost.

a: Some of the participants received the questionnaires and announced that they would back them to the executors after completing them, but unfortunately 39 questionnaires were not returned.

Unfortunately, due to the large number of participants at the same time completing the questionnaires and left the place after completing the questionnaire, it was not possible to ask them to complete the missing parts of the questionnaire immediately.

b: Also, out of 261 questionnaires, 20 of them could not be measured and were not qualified to enter the software, and unfortunately, the rate of their incompleteness was such that it was not possible to use imputation methods.

although we asked the participants to return the questionnaires and we did the follow ups, but 39 questionnaires were lost and also 20 questionnaires were so incomplete that they could not be used even by using imputation methods.

Q3: The ref. for sample size is invalid. Which journal?

R: The reference was changed and a valid reference was replaced.

Q4: There is no explanation about terms: "path, factor loads, errors, …"

R: The mentioned explanation was applied.

Q5: Since, it seems that some confounders could influence the results, it was better to use some other sampling methods such as, judgmental method. We don't see anything about confounding variables.

R: According to the explanations mentioned in the text and for ease of work and also by referring to the literature and previous studies that used the same methods, it was decided to use the available sampling method.

*Q6: Explain about * and ** in Table 3.*

R: Table 3 examines the relationship between attachment styles and personality traits, which confirms the general relationship between them.

* correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

** correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Q7: References need to be checked with cautions:

a. Some references were not found (ex. 11, 13, 14). Are they in Persian?

b. The names of journals were not mentioned in some references.

c. Different name of the author in the text and REFERENCE. (Isanejad or Esinejad?)

R: References checked.

a. Reference 11 was replaced by a valid reference. References 13 and 14 were Persian references mentioned in the references.

b. References were reviewed and revised.

c. Text and reference were matched (Isanejad).

Q8: The abbreviations should be explained in the first use. (NFI, CFI, IFI, …)

R: The abbreviations explained.

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: EIC | **Revision** (2) 27 Sep 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.