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

KOWSAR
International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijhrba.109168
Published in: International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction: In Press(In Press); e109168

Peer Review Report for "Relationship Between the Use of Pornography and Marital Sexual Satisfaction and Attitudes Towards Marital Infidelity in Married Women in Zahedan City"

Author(s): Zahra Nikmanesh, Samane Ganjaly

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	6 Sep 2020
Revised Date:	10 Jan 2021
Accepted Date:	4 Apr 2021

Revision (0)

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

Fahimeh Fathali Lavasani: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 26 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
The taboo nature of the variables should be considered in the analysis of the results
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 14 Dec 2020

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** (0) — 14 Dec 2020

Dear author,

Highlight the changes in the main file

Answer the comments one by one in reply to reviewers file completely

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.

ID: 109168: The Relationship between the Use of Pornography and Marital Sexual Satisfaction and Attitudes towards Marital Infidelity in Married Women Zahedan City

Abstract

- Conclusion needs to be corrected:
  Conclusion does not match the evaluated variable. Attitudes toward marital infidelity are not the same as infidelity.
  It's done

Introduction

Reviewing research results requires more organization. It's done

-

Objective: the first paragraph has little to do with the purpose of the research. It is recommended to delete. It's deleted

-

Method

Mention:

1. Sample size formula. It's added.
2. Actions taken to answer the questionnaires correctly (PPUS & Attitudes toward Infidelity Scale) due to their taboo nature. It's added

Results

- The format of the tables needs to be modified. . It's done
-

Conclusion:

- Mention:
  1. A very low score on the scale of pornography use may be due to its taboo nature. It's added.
  2. The lower scores of employed women on the PPUS compared to housewives may be due to their fears and concerns about the employment situation It's added.
  3. The same is true of the Attitudes toward Infidelity Scale. It's added.

4. The results are inconsistent with the research literature on the relationship between pornography and sexual satisfaction. This needs to be explained in terms of cultural and subcultural factors. It's added.

- Reference 29 in the text has nothing to do with the relationship between pornography and sexual satisfaction It's deleted

Limitation:

Mention: the effect of the nature of the questionnaires on the participants' answers It's added.

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) 27 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
I have already reviewed this manuscript. It needs some major revisions.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 4 Apr 2021

Dear EIC,
The changes are acceptable.
The authors should just modify the conclusion in abstract: reduce the positive attitude towards marital infidelity in married women.
add the abstract in full manuscript file.
regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 4 Apr 2021

Dear author,
the changes are acceptable.
just modify ADD A WORD IN the conclusion in abstract at FINAL GALLEY PROOF: reduce the positive attitude towards marital infidelity in married women.
regards,