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.112178
Published in: International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction: In Press(In Press); e112178

Peer Review Report for "Cyberbullying and Its Contributing Factors Among Iranian Adolescents"

Author(s): Ghazal Shariatpanahi, Kia Tahouri, Mahsa Asadabadi, Atousa Moienafshar, Maryam Nazari, Azadeh Sayarifard

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 15 Dec 2020
Revised Date: 16 Jun 2021
Accepted Date: 19 Jun 2021

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) — 15 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
The manuscript have some good epacts. However it need these changes:
- The text need to be edited essentially
- The arrangement of paper is not suitable and according to the Journal format.
- There is additional explanation in the methodology
- The reliability method for tool is not mentioned. The tool is not descripted, if it has interval scale. Chi square is not suitable method. Also, the tool was not one part. You need to report the reliability for each part (at least two part).
- References are not update and enough. The introduction and discussion have to be changed accordingly.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 5 May 2021

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)**

5 May 2021

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.

Title: Cyberbullying and its contributing factors in Iranian adolescents

Reviewer's comments	Responses
1-The manuscript have some good epacts. However it need these changes:	1-Dear Reviewer, Thank you for taking the time to review the manuscript. The authors tried to make corrections based on the comments as much as possible.
2-The text need to be edited essentially	2-In addition to structural corrections, the text was edited
3-The arrangement of paper is not suitable and according to the Journal format.	3-The journal guidelines for authors were reviewed again and the format adjusted according to the guidelines
4-There is additional explanation in the methodology. The reliability method for tool is not mentioned. The tool is not descripted, if it has interval scale. You need to report the reliability for each part (at least two part).	4-Further descriptions of the tool were added, as well as the validity and reliability of the tool.
5-Chi square is not suitable method. Also, the tool was not one part.	5-There were three main questions in the study includes: 1- Experience of being cyberbullied; 2- Experience of attempt to cyberbullying; 3- Exposure of close friends with cyberbullying. The objective of this study was to examine the prevalence of experience of cyberbullying among adolescents and examining the hypothesis that the experience of cyberbullying is related to some characteristics of the respondents or not? The structure of presentation of descriptive findings related to different items of all three main areas of the tool results in the text and in the form of Table 1 was modified. To analyze the relationship between cyberbullying experience and demographic

	characteristics studied in the study, two main questions were used (Experience of being cyberbullied, and Attempt to cyberbullying) for this purpose, so chi-square test was used.
6-References are not update and enough. The introduction and discussion have to be changed accordingly.	6-The References were updated and added and introduction and discussion been revised accordingly.

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)** 26 May 2021

Dear author,
The article is very bulky. Decrease the words to 4000 with maintaining the integrity and corrections.
after that the article will be reconsidered.
upload the the past reply to reviewers file again.
Reconsider the limitation, conclusions, ethical considerations and footnotes.
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.

Title: Cyberbullying and its contributing factors in Iranian adolescents

Reviewer's comments	Responses
1-The manuscript have some good epacts. However it need these changes:	1-Dear Reviewer, Thank you for taking the time to review the manuscript. The authors tried to make corrections based on the comments as much as possible.
2-The text need to be edited essentially	2-In addition to structural corrections, the text was edited
3-The arrangement of paper is not suitable and according to the Journal format.	3-The journal guidelines for authors were reviewed again and the format adjusted according to the guidelines
4-There is additional explanation in the methodology. The reliability method for tool is not mentioned. The tool is not descripted, if it has interval scale. You need to report the reliability for each part (at least two part).	4-Further descriptions of the tool were added, as well as the validity and reliability of the tool.
5-Chi square is not suitable method. Also, the tool was not one part.	5-There were three main questions in the study includes: 1- Experience of being cyberbullied; 2- Experience of attempt to cyberbullying; 3- Exposure of close friends with cyberbullying. The objective of this study was to examine the prevalence of experience of cyberbullying among adolescents and examining the hypothesis that the experience of cyberbullying is related to some characteristics of the respondents or not? The structure of presentation of descriptive findings related to different items of all three main areas of the tool results in the text and in the form of Table 1 was modified. To analyze the relationship between cyberbullying experience and demographic

	characteristics studied in the study, two main questions were used (Experience of being cyberbullied, and Attempt to cyberbullying) for this purpose, so chi-square test was used.
6-References are not update and enough. The introduction and discussion have to be changed accordingly.	6-The References were updated and added and introduction and discussion been revised accordingly.
EIC Decision: Dear author, The article is very bulky. Decrease the words to 4000 with maintaining the integrity and corrections. after that the article will be reconsidered. upload the the past reply to reviewers file again. Reconsider the limitation, conclusions, ethical considerations and footnotes.	The words decreased to 3997 with maintaining the integrity, corrections and revision. The limitation of study mentioned at the end of discussion. Conclusion was revised after the corrections were made.

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) 13 Jun 2021

Dear author,
The changes are acceptable.
Add these related references to your paper:
https://sites.kowsarpub.com/ijhrba/articles/107530.html
https://sites.kowsarpub.com/ijhrba/articles/98997.html
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.

Title: Cyberbullying and its contributing factors in Iranian adolescents

Reviewer's comment	Response
1- *Dear author,* *The changes are acceptable.* *Add these related references to your paper:* *https://sites.kowsarpub.com/ijhrba/articles/107530.html* *https://sites.kowsarpub.com/ijhrba/articles/98997.html*	1-Dear Reviewer, Thank you for your kind attention. The suggested references were added.

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) 19 Jun 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.