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.106880
Published in: International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction: 9(4); e106880

# Peer Review Report for "Relationship Between Adoption and Suicide Attempts: A Meta-analysis"

**Author(s):** Adalberto Campo-Arias, Jorge Armando Egurrola-Pedraza, Edwin Herazo

## Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 29 Jun 2020
Revised Date: 19 Aug 2020
Accepted Date: 22 Aug 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)

16 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
- More suitable title should be selected for the article.
- The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.
- It is suggested to present the structure of the article at the end of the introduction.
- The necessity and innovation of the article should be presented to the introduction.
- The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.
- Please avoid reference overkill/run-on, i.e. do not use more than 3 references per sentence.
- More suitable title should be presented for the table 1 instead of “Summary of case-control studies”.
- Sections and subsections should be numbered in order.
- Following, you will find some new related references which should be added to the literature review:
Van Zeebroeck, S. Gods or Monsters? Non-Explicit Consent in the hastening of deaths by

Intensivists in Belgium;
Orooji & Langarizadeh. Using of Natural Language Processing Techniques in Suicide Research;
Gamble & Crouse. Strategies for Supporting and Building Student Resilience in Canadian Secondary and Post-Secondary Educational Institutions;
Rokach, A. Loneliness in Pre and Post-operative Cancer Patients: A Mini-Review.
- Page 3: the following paragraph is unclear, so please reorganize that:
“Case-control studies computed 69 suicide attempts in 1,216 adopted people compared to 436 attempts in 20,555 non-adopted people (OR = 2.30, 95% CI 1.24- 4.28, random due to high heterogeneity, I2 = 61%). See Table 1. Cohort studies added 536 suicide attempts in 36,965 people in adoption compared to 15,112 attempts in 3,118,069 non-adopted people (RR = 2.99, 95% CI 2.54-3.53, random due to high heterogeneity, I2 = 73%). See more information in table 2.”
- Sections and subsections should be numbered in order.
- Much more explanations and interpretations must be added for the results, which are not enough.
- It is suggested to compare the results of the present research with some similar studies which is done before.
- Conclusion section should be added to the article. Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value-added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value-added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.
- “Notation” should be added to the article.
- DOI of the references must be added (you can use “https://crossref.org/").
Thanks.

**anahita khodabakhshi koolaee**: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 22 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
- The title of article is novel and attractive. However, the text needs deep correction in content and English writing.
- The abstract is really abstract. There was main information were missing, such as; results and conclusion.
- The purpose of the research is not clear in the introduction. It is better to use more references to explain and clarify the purpose and question of the research.
- The research plan, and analyzed data were not written by details.
- Previous research and examination of differences and similarities have not been mentioned in the discussion. The text of the article is more like a very short report.
- The authors should added the conclusion, limitations and suggestions.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 26 Jul 2020

Dear EIC,
The authors should answer the comments one by one in reply to reviewers file highlight the

changes in main file.
regards,

**REFEREE**: EIC | **Revision** (0) 26 Jul 2020

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.

Santa Marta, Colombia, August 9th, 2020.

Thank you very much for the pertinent comments and suggestions. For easy review, new information is highlighted in green. Next, we respond to each of the comments or suggestions.

Reviewer 1

The title of article is novel and attractive. However, the text needs deep correction in content and English writing.
Answer: Thanks. It was reviewed.

The abstract is really abstract. There was main information were missing, such as; results and conclusion.
Answer: Thanks. It was reviewed and completed.

The purpose of the research is not clear in the introduction. It is better to use more references to explain and clarify the purpose and question of the research.
Answer: Thanks. We tried to give more information.

The research plan, and analyzed data were not written by details.
Answer: Thanks. We tried to give more information.

Previous research and examination of differences and similarities have not been mentioned in the discussion. The text of the article is more like a very short report. The authors should added the conclusion, limitations and suggestions.
Answer: Thanks. We included the information.

Reviewer 2

More suitable title should be selected for the article.
Answer: Thanks. It was reviewed.

The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.
Answer: Thanks. We did.

It is suggested to present the structure of the article at the end of the introduction.
Answer: Thanks. We present it.

The necessity and innovation of the article should be presented to the introduction.
Answer: Thanks. We tried to give more information.

The major defect of this study is the debate or argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

Answer: Thanks. We tried to give more information.

Please avoid reference overkill/run-on, i.e. do not use more than 3 references per sentence.
Answer: Thanks. We tried to do it.

More suitable title should be presented for the table 1 instead of “Summary of case-control studies”.
Answer: Thanks. We gave new titles.

Sections and sub-sections should be numbered in order.
Answer: Thanks. We tried to do it.

Following, you will find some new related references which should be added to literature review: Van Zeebroeck, S. Gods or Monsters? Non-Explicit Consent in the hastening of deaths by Intensivists in Belgium; Orooji & Langarizadeh. Using of Natural Language Processing Techniques in Suicide Research; Gamble & Crouse. Strategies for Supporting and Building Student Resilience in Canadian Secondary and Post-Secondary Educational Institutions; Rokach, A. Loneliness in Pre and Post-operative Cancer Patients: A Mini Review.
Answer: Thanks.

Page 3: the following paragraph is unclear, so please reorganize that:
“Case-control studies computed 69 suicide attempts in 1,216 adopted people compared to 436 attempts in 20,555 non-adopted people (OR = 2.30, 95% CI 1.24- 4.28, random due to high heterogeneity, I2 = 61%). See Table 1. Cohort studies added 536 suicide attempts in 36,965 people in adoption compared to 15,112 attempts in 3,118,069 non-adopted people (RR = 2.99, 95% CI 2.54-3.53, random due to high heterogeneity, I2 = 73%). See more information in table 2.”
Answer: Thanks. We review it.

Sections and sub-sections should be numbered in order.
Answer: Thanks. We did it.

Much more explanations and interpretations must be added for the results, which are not enough.
Answer: Thanks. We did it.

It is suggested to compare the results of the present research with some similar studies which is done before.
Answer: Thanks. We review it.

Conclusion section should be added to the article. Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.
Answer: Thanks. We review it.

“Notation” should be added to the article.
Answer: Thanks. We review it.

DOI of the references must be added (you can use https://crossref.org/).
Answer: Thanks. We included them.

**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)** 12 Aug 2020

Dear Author,
The changes are acceptable but: introduction and especially discussion should be more weighty, it is better to discuss why adopted people are vulnerable to suicide and mental health problems (like adoption stigma-discrimination,...).
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.

Santa Marta, Colombia, August 17th, 2020.

Thank you very much for the positive comments about the new version. For easy review, new information is highlighted in green.

*The changes are acceptable but introduction and specially discussion should be more weighty, it is better to discuss why adopted people are vulnerable to suicide and mental health problems (like adoption stigma-discrimination, ...).*

Answer: The introduction was expanded with a paragraph, and two more items were added to strengthen the discussion.

**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) 22 Aug 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.