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.108823
Published in: International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction: 10(2); e108823

Peer Review Report for "Prevalence of Child Abuse and Correlations with Family Factors Among Elementary School-aged Children"

Author(s): Raheleh Rafaiee, Fahimeh Mohseni, Nafiseh Akbarian

Review Timeline:

- Submit Date: 25 Aug 2020
- Revised Date: 18 Jan 2021
- Accepted Date: 24 Jan 2021

Revision (0)

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

Azizallah Dehghan: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 14 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
This is a good article, but the following points should be considered by the authors:.
1. Explain how the sample size was calculated?
2. Is there a Persian version of the questionnaire and does it have acceptable validity and reliability?
3. Explain the strengths and weaknesses of the study.
4. References are not available in the manuscript file.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 12 Jan 2021

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)** 12 Jan 2021

Dear author,

Highlight the changes in the 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.

Dear Dr. Nour-Mohammad Bakhshani,

Thank you for your email dated 12 January 2021 enclosing the reviewers' comments. We have carefully reviewed the comments and have revised the manuscript accordingly. Our responses are given in a point-by-point manner below. Changes to the manuscript are shown in yellow. We hope the revised version is now suitable for publication and look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Sincerely,

Dr. Fahimeh Mohseni

Response to Reviewer:

Thank you for reading our manuscript and reviewing it, which will help us improve it to a better scientific level. Our response follows.

Comment 1. Explain how the sample size was calculated?

Response: We thank the reviewer for this comment. The information about method used to calculate sample size was added to method section.

According to previous studies in Iran, the pooled estimate of the prevalence of child physical abuse in both genders was 43.591%, and the pooled estimate of the prevalence of child emotional abuse was 64.533%. In regards to child neglect, the pooled estimate of the prevalence was 40.945%. Taking into account this prevalence rates, and according to (α=0.05 and P= 50%, d=0.05), the sample size was calculated 384 participants, which in the present study is considered to be 400 participants.

$$\text{Sample size} = \frac{Z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}^{2} \times P(1-P)}{d^2} \Rightarrow \frac{1.96^2 \times 0.5(1-0.5)}{0.05^2} = 384$$

Comment 2. Is there a Persian version of the questionnaire and does it have acceptable validity and reliability?

Response: We thank the reviewer for this comment. As we wrote in method section, our data were collected using a valid and reliable Persian questionnaire. The mean clarity and relevance of the Persian questionnaire were 80.36% and 92.5%, respectively, and the relevance of questions ranged from 90.14 to 97.2. Further analysis of data showed the average intraclass correlation and Cronbach's alpha coefficients to be 0.95 and 0.92, respectively.

The design and validation of the Persian version of child abuse questionnaire has been a master's thesis in epidemiology in School of Health, in Tehran University of Medical Sciences. We applied their questionnaire and cited their published paper (The reference mentioned below).

Hosseinkhani Z, Nedjat S, Majdzadeh R, Mahram M, Aflatooni A. Design of the child abuse Questionnaire in Iran. Journal of School of Public Health and Institute of Public Health Research. 2014;11(3):29-38.

Comment 3. Explain the strengths and weaknesses of the study.
Response: We thank the reviewer for this comment. The strengths and weaknesses of the study were added to discussion section.

Comment 4. References are not available in the manuscript file.
Response: We apologize for this problem and thank you for comment. There were all references in the submitted word file but they probably deleted in the blind PDF file. We checked the references before submission of revised manuscript file.

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)** 24 Jan 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.