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.108648
Published in: International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction: 10(2); e108648

Peer Review Report for "The Study of Suicide and Attempted Suicide Epidemiology in Sirjan in 2018"

Author(s): Mohadeseh Balvardi, Zahra Imani-Goghary, Kamran Babaee, Zahra Izadabadi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 19 Aug 2020
Revised Date: 6 Mar 2021
Accepted Date: 7 Mar 2021

Revision (0)

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

Gholamreza soleimani: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 29 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
Given the problem of suicide in today's society, it is very useful to review such articles to examine a useful solution to prevent its occurrence. In your article, only the epidemiological issues of this issue have been addressed and no logical solution has been provided for it. Therefore, it is recommended that the present article be a step forward in future articles.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 27 Dec 2020

Dear AE,
The authors should:
- Explain the variables related to high risk suicide incidence in sirjan and the most common suicide method.
- Add the number of sample in abstract.
regards,

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

Dear EIC

The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0)

28 Dec 2020

Dear author,
Highlight the changes in main file
Answer the comments one by one in reply to reviewers file completely
Comment 1: …
Response 1: ...
Reconsider the limitation, conclusions, ethical considerations and footnotes.
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.

Answer to Reviewer 1:

Dear Reviewer: thanks for your good advice, as you recommended we added this sentence to our article "therefore, the present article can be a step forward in future researches to consider interventions to improve mental health and find useful solution to prevent suicide occurrence."

Answer to Reviewer 2:

Dear Reviewer: thanks for your good advices, as you recommended we added "*the variables related to high risk suicide incidence in Sirjan and the most common suicide method in results section. Also we add a brief part and the number of sample in abstract*"

Comment 1: *explain the variables related to high risk suicide incidence in sirjan*

Answer 1: In this study, 12 deaths occurred due to suicide attempt (1.56 in 100,000 population), most of suicide cases occurred in male (10 cases), in those aged10-19 as the same as those aged 20-29 years old (40% in each age group). Most people who had successful suicide were single (7 cases), which was 5 of 10 cases of male and all the female (2 of 2). Among people who did suicide, most of them were urbanite (11 of 12 cases), and most held a high school diploma (7of 12).

Comment 2: *the most common suicide method.*

Answer 2: Hanging was the most common method of suicide in men (60%).

Comment 3: *add the number of sample in abstract.*

Answer 3: **:** "A total of 768 people referred to Sirjan's hospitals with the diagnosis of suicide attempt" added to absteact

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)** 11 Jan 2021

Dear author,
most of changes are acceptable,
but explain about why the rate of suicide is so high in sirjan in detail, it is so important in your study .
explain about sirjan in background too in detail (like geographical and economic status).
reduce the words count under 3500.
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.

Answer to Editor-in-Chief

Dear Editor-in-Chief: thanks for your good advice, as you recommended we omit some extra words but unfortunately the word count is more than 3500 with references yet.

For *explaining about why the rate of suicide is so high in Sirjan, we* added some sentence to our article (they are highlighted in manuscript), but it needs more research.

it may be related to access to agricultural pesticides, that is used in pistachio gardens, in addition to other common suicide methods, as other studies point to the pesticides as a common suicide method in developing countries(23)

Hard working condition because of presence of mines, may be another cofactor for increasing the rate of suicide attempts in Sirjan, which is mentioned in another study (26) too.

Best Regards

Imanigoghary

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) 24 Jan 2021

Dear author,
it is important to add the contents about
suicides rate are more than 20 times higher than other places in discussion, why?
add more proposals in conclusion for these and promote the article.
regards,

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.

Answer to Editor-in-Chief

Dear Editor-in-Chief: thanks for your good advice, We mentioned that attempt suicides rate are more than 20 times higher than completed suicide, with the following sentence: “nonlethal suicide rates are more than 20 times higher than suicide”, which it is a comparison between attempt suicides and completed suicide in Sirjan. This sentence may cause a misunderstanding, so I omit it. Also I highlighted the related results

Best 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: EIC | **Revision** (3) 7 Feb 2021

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 (4)

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.

Answer to Editor-in-Chief

Dear Editor-in-Chief: we highlight the changed parts in the discussion and try to correct our mistakes, 1. agricultural pesticides was reported as poison which is corrected in this version, 2. a mistake was happened in reporting attempt suicide between the single and married in discussion section that it is corrected too.

So we hope it reach to intended criteria.

Best Regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (4)

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (4)** 3 Mar 2021

Dear author,
The changes are acceptable.
use these related sources in your work:
https://sites.kowsarpub.com/ijhrba/articles/19664.html
https://sites.kowsarpub.com/ijhrba/articles/19659.html
regards,

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (5)

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.

Answer to Editor-in-Chief

Dear Editor-in-Chief: we added the mentioned sources in manuscript and we highlighted them.

Best Regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (5)

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (5) 7 Mar 2021

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