International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction
Volume 11 · Issue 2 · e121942

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Gender Differences in the Effect of Resilience Training on Emotional Intelligence in At-Risk Students in Shiraz, Iran

Hassan Joulaei, faranak fathi, Tayebeh Rakhshani, Mahin Nazari, Zahra Hosseinkhani, Maryam Fatemi, Zohre Foroozanfar

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
14 Dec 2021	27 Apr 2022	28 Apr 2022	10.5812/ijhrba-121942

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 5

1 Original submission

1 comment · 14 Apr 2022

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 14 Apr 2022

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

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Reviewer 1:
The present manuscript deals with a current and relevant theme in the world scenario; the work is well written and can be published in this journal. However, I suggest to the authors some notes that can improve the quality of the manuscript.
1-At the end of the introduction, I recommend inserting the research hypotheses more clearly because they are not in the text. Don't forget to bring them again to the "discussion" topic. Thank you, it is done.

2-Regarding the method, although the authors have inserted the inclusion criteria for the participants, you also need to insert the exclusion criteria. Thank you, it is added.

3- It was unclear to me how the participants were recruited, which needs to be presented in the text. Thank you, it is mentioned
4-The authors could also describe the data analysis in more detail, as some statistical components are important for the readers to understand these analyses' steps. Additional information about the data analysis method was added in the method section, also the type of statistical tests were added under the tables.
5-Finally, I recommend that the authors insert future directions for further studies in the text's conclusion. Good comment, we mentioned it in the conclusion.

Reviewer 2:
Abstract:
1-Pre-post study is more common. Thank you, it is done.
2-(P=0.013)... is unclear in abstract. It is better to use mean and SD. Due to the limited number of words in the abstract, we could not mention the mean and deviation of the before and after criteria in the abstract, but we noted that the score of these dimensions increased significantly after the intervention and reported a significant value.
3-Add the analysis methods in method part. Thank you, it is done.
Discussion:
paragraph 1 and 2:
It is important in your results, Why? Interpret the results.
Why do the intervention not to be useful for girl? Thank you, it is done.
Accept after revision

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 28 Apr 2022

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 28 Apr 2022

accept