International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction
Volume 13 · Issue 2 · e145235

OPEN PEER REVIEW

# Metacognitive Therapy Versus Cognitive Behavioral Therapy for OCD: A Randomized Controlled Trial

Sepideh Rajezi, Peyman Ansari, Hamid Yaghubi, Ladan Fata, Hamidreza Hassanabadi, Sima Sadat Noorbakhsh, Jennifer Jordan, Alireza Zahiroddin, Jamal Shams, Masoud Janbozorgi, Yazdan Naderi Rajeh, Hamed Ahmadi

| SUBMITTED | REVISED | ACCEPTED | DOI |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2 Mar 2024 | 16 Jun 2024 | 18 Jun 2024 | 10.5812/ijhrba-145235 |

## 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** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief ..... 2
2 **Revision 1** Editor-in-Chief ..... 3
**Authors' reply to reviewers** ..... 4
**Reviewer and editor comments** ..... 6
3 **Revision 2** Editor-in-Chief ..... 7
**Authors' reply to reviewers** ..... 8
**Reviewer and editor comments** ..... 9

## 1 Original submission

2 comments · 11 May 2024 – 11 May 2024

### Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 11 May 2024

Minor Revision

### Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 11 May 2024

Minor Revision

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:
I would like to thank you for inviting me to review this manuscript. I read the article carefully. While it is an interesting topic to review, some concerns lead me to recommend minor revisions for this manuscript.

The abstract section is not acceptable in its current form. This section must include subheadings of Background, Objectives, Methods, Results, and Conclusions.

Reply to reviewer: thank you for your comment; manuscript edit according to this comment

In the results section, the authors have pointed to the mean scores of WHODAS 2.0 among two study groups, but in the measure's subheading, this scale is not described.

Reply to reviewer: added in manuscript ...

WHO Disability Assessment Schedule 2.0 (WHODAS 2.0: This instrument is intended to assess disability in general areas of life based on the biopsychosocial model in accordance with the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) (49). In DSM-5, Axis V, i.e. General Assessment of Functioning (GAF), was replaced with the WHODAS 2.0 (1). Over a thirty-day period, the WHODAS 2.0 captures an individual's level of functioning in six general areas of life: (1) cognition, (2) mobility, (3) self-care, (4) getting along with people, (5) life activities (household activities/ work or school activities), and (6) participation. To obtain the overall score, item scores within each domain are summed, yielding a total between 0 (no disability) to 100 (complete disability). The psychometric properties of the instrument have been assessed and verified in various countries (50) including Iran (51).

The authors should also include a conclusions section at the end of the article. This section should be briefly described the practical implications of the study, followed by recommendations for future studies.

Reply to reviewer**:** Conclusion section added in manuscript

There are minor concerns regarding English grammar, expression, and acronyms. So, I strongly recommend that the paper be checked by a native English speaker or professional English editing service before re-submission. Additionally, before using acronyms, the authors should define them separately in the abstract and main text.

Reply to reviewer: thank you for your comment; manuscript edit according to this comment

## 2 Revision 1

1 comment · 12 Jun 2024

### Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 12 Jun 2024

Dear author,
The changes are acceptable.
Decrease the word count (4500). Please pay attention to the reviewers' comments and the consistency of the content.
regards,

3

# Revision 2

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.

,Greetings

.Word count: yes, the word count was reduced to 4500

,With thanks

## 3 Revision 2

1 comment · 18 Jun 2024

### Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 18 Jun 2024

accept