

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 "[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:

[Peer Review](#)



International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5812/ijhrba-161579>

Published in: International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction: 14(3) ; e161579

Peer Review Report for "Examination of Violence Among Individuals with Police Records in Ilam City Police Stations"

Author(s): Fathola Mohamadian, Sajad Sohrabnejad, Mohamadreza Gachi, Yousef Veisani, Sehat Aibod

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 30 Mar 2025

Revised Date: 17 Jul 2025

Accepted Date: 19 Jul 2025

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

5 May 2025

Dear AE,

The paper makes a meaningful contribution by thoroughly examining various factors linked to violence, providing a solid foundation for policy and intervention planning. Further longitudinal and qualitative studies could deepen understanding and facilitate more effective violence reduction programs.

thanks for improved paper based this Critical Remarks & Recommendations:

Cross-Sectional Design: The study's design limits conclusions about causality. Future research could benefit from a longitudinal approach to better understand temporal

relationships.

what is your justification?

Sampling & Generalizability: The sample of 400 files is random, but it's unclear if it fully represents all individuals visiting police stations in Ilam or if there are any selection biases.

what is your justification?

Cultural Context: While the study briefly mentions Ilam's unique cultural features, more in-depth contextualization could highlight regional-specific factors influencing violence.

doi: 10.18502/ijph.v50i10.7525

Intervention Strategies: While identifying risk factors is valuable, the paper could be strengthened by discussing specific, evidence-based intervention approaches tailored to these findings.

DOI: 10.32598/irj.16.4.395

Psychological Variables: The study notes the relationship between psychiatric visits, criminal records, and violence but could explore further the nature of these psychological factors and their implications for mental health services. such as job properties and covid-19 pandemic psychological effect and...

DOI: 10.32598/hdq.9.4.527.2

doi: 10.3233/WOR-213648

DOI: 10.4103/jehp.jehp_1425_21

DOI: 10.32598/hdq.7.2.189.20

doi: 10.3233/WOR-203306

Discussion and Conclusion: A thorough analysis and interpretation of the study findings in the upcoming sections could significantly strengthen the scientific contribution of the article

use new updated references such as above :

[https://doi.org/10.1016/s2468-2667\(22\)00134-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s2468-2667(22)00134-7)

Additional Variables: Including data on mental health diagnoses or community-level violence indicators could offer more nuanced insights.

REFeree : Reviewer

12 May 2025

Dear AE,

Scope of the Journal: The article is within the scope of the International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction, addressing sociobehavioral risk factors and violence-related issues.

Novelty: The study adds novelty by focusing on violence cases documented in police records within a specific geographic context (Ilam), using real-world data and

exploring multifactorial correlates.

Title

Title Reflects Content: Yes. It clearly indicates the population (individuals with police records), location (Ilam), and subject matter (violence).

Abbreviation in Title: No abbreviations are used.

Abstract

Structured Abstract: Yes, includes Background, Methods, Results, and Conclusion.

Keywords from MeSH: Partially. "Violence" and "Police Stations" are relevant; however, keywords like "Ilam" may not align with MeSH and should be reconsidered for standardization.

Introduction

Objectives Clearly Stated: Yes. The aim to investigate the status and correlates of violence among individuals in police records is explicitly stated.

Includes What is Known, Not Known, and Aims: Yes. It reviews previous knowledge, identifies the research gap, and presents a well-defined aim.

Materials and Methods

Participant Selection Described: Yes. Random sampling of 400 cases from police records is clearly stated.

Study Design Described: Yes. Descriptive-analytical approach is mentioned.

Adequacy of the Sample: Yes. 400 participants are appropriate for this kind of epidemiological study.

Representativeness of Subjects: Generally yes, but limited to a specific locale (Ilam), which may limit generalizability.

Sample Size Calculation Provided: No formal sample size calculation or power analysis is mentioned.

Control Subjects Appropriate: Not applicable; this is an observational study without control/intervention arms.

Power of Study Declared: Not declared.

Actual P-values Reported: Yes, p-values are reported throughout.

Blinding of Investigators: Not applicable or mentioned.

Blinding of Subjects: Not applicable.

Methods/Apparatus Identified with Manufacturer: No manufacturer details needed or provided.

Procedures Described for Reproducibility: Yes. Questionnaire-based data collection and statistical analysis methods are described in detail.

Drugs/Chemicals Used: Not applicable.

Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria Explained: Partially. Only general inclusion (case records related to violence) is stated.

Statistical Analysis Appropriate: Yes. Chi-square, Pearson correlation, and Kendall's Tau-c were appropriately used.

Results

Tables and Figures: Tables are comprehensive, well-structured, and clearly present relationships between variables and types of violence.

Logical Presentation of Results: Yes. Results are presented in logical sequence with clear headings and explanations.

Data Duplication: No duplication detected.

Use of Technical Terms: Generally appropriate and statistically accurate.

Discussion

Conclusion Justified: Yes. The conclusions are supported by the results.

Analysis Supports Conclusion: Yes. Discussion is analytical and references previous research appropriately.

References

References Properly Written: Yes, format is consistent and professional.

Recent References: Yes. Many references are from 2020–2024, including the most recent studies in 2023–2025.

Kind Regards

REFeree : Associate Editor

15 May 2025

Dear EIC,

The manuscript has been studied, and some comments should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.

Kind regards,
AE

Nour-Mohammad Bakhshani : EIC

15 May 2025

Dear Author,

Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs major revision. Please follow their comments as requested.

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.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

hello dear

The paper makes a meaningful contribution by thoroughly examining various factors linked to violence, providing a solid foundation for policy and intervention planning. Further longitudinal and qualitative studies could deepen understanding and facilitate more effective violence reduction programs.

Reply: Thank you very much for your valuable comments. We truly appreciate your recognition of our efforts to examine various factors linked to violence and your suggestion for further research. We agree that longitudinal and qualitative studies would enrich our understanding and provide a more comprehensive basis for intervention strategies. We will certainly consider this direction in our future research agenda. Accordingly, we have revised the "Limitations and Future Research" section to highlight the need for longitudinal and qualitative studies in future investigations.

thanks for improved paper based this Critical Remarks & Recommendations:

Cross-Sectional Design: The study's design limits conclusions about causality. Future research could benefit from a longitudinal approach to better understand temporal relationships.

Reply: Thank you very much for this important and constructive comment. We fully acknowledge the limitations inherent in the cross-sectional design, especially regarding the inability to draw causal inferences. In response, we have explicitly addressed this issue in the revised manuscript within the Limitations section of the Discussion. Additionally, we have emphasized the necessity of future longitudinal studies to better investigate temporal and potential causal relationships among the variables. In lines 369 to 390.

what is your justification?

Sampling & Generalizability: The sample of 400 files is random, but it's unclear if it fully represents all individuals visiting police stations in Ilam or if there are any selection biases.

what is your justification?

Reply: We appreciate your valuable feedback.

According to your suggestion, the Materials and Methods section was revised to specify the study period, clarify the sampling method, and acknowledge potential selection bias limitations. These revisions have been made in lines 103 to 110.

Cultural Context: While the study briefly mentions Ilam's unique cultural features, more in-depth contextualization could highlight regional-specific factors influencing violence.

doi: 10.18502/ijph.v50i10.7525

Reply: Thank you for your valuable comment regarding the need for deeper contextualization of Ilam's cultural background. In response, we have expanded the discussion on the region's unique cultural characteristics and their potential influence on patterns of violence. These additions have been incorporated into the Introduction section, specifically in lines 68 to 75.

Intervention Strategies: While identifying risk factors is valuable, the paper could be strengthened by discussing specific, evidence-based intervention approaches tailored to these findings. DOI: 10.32598/irj.16.4.395

Reply: Thank you for your valuable suggestion. In response, we have added a paragraph in the Discussion section (lines 379 to 386) outlining evidence-based intervention strategies tailored to the cultural context of Ilam. This addition strengthens the practical implications of the study.

Psychological Variables: The study notes the relationship between psychiatric visits, criminal records, and violence but could explore further the nature of these psychological factors and their implications for mental health services.

such as job properties and covid-19 pandemic psychological effect and...

DOI: 10.32598/hdq.9.4.527.2

doi: 10.3233/WOR-213648

DOI: 10.4103/jehp.jehp_1425_21

DOI: 10.32598/hdq.7.2.189.20

doi: 10.3233/WOR-203306

Reply: We appreciate the reviewer's valuable suggestion regarding the exploration of psychological variables and their implications for mental health services. In response, we have expanded the discussion to further elaborate on the role of psychiatric visits, criminal records, job-related stress, and the psychological impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic as factors influencing violent behavior. We have also highlighted the importance of tailored mental health services and evidence-based psychological interventions to address these issues. These revisions have been incorporated in lines 325 to 340 of the manuscript.

Discussion and Conclusion: A thorough analysis and interpretation of the study findings in the upcoming sections could significantly strengthen the scientific contribution of the article use new updated references such as abowe :

[https://doi.org/10.1016/s2468-2667\(22\)00134-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s2468-2667(22)00134-7)

Reply: Thank you for your valuable feedback. The requested revisions have been made in lines 302 to 310.

Additional Variables: Including data on mental health diagnoses or community-level violence indicators could offer more nuanced insights.

Reply: Thank you very much for your valuable suggestion regarding the inclusion of psychiatric disorders and community-level violence indicators as additional variables. In response, we have incorporated these variables into the multivariate logistic regression analysis, and the results are now presented in Table 8.

The relevant changes have been made in the Results section, lines 262 to 278, where we detailed the statistical findings, and in the Discussion section, lines 339 to 352, where we elaborated on the implications of these findings.

We believe these additions have enriched the manuscript by providing a more nuanced understanding of the predictors of self-injury.

Reviewer 2:

Subject

Scope of the Journal: The article is within the scope of the International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction, addressing sociobehavioral risk factors and violence-related issues.

Reply: We sincerely appreciate the reviewer's careful and positive evaluation regarding the alignment of our manuscript with the scope of the International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction. We are glad that our study has been recognized as valuable within the context of psychosocial risk factors and violence-related topics.

Novelty: The study adds novelty by focusing on violence cases documented in police records within a specific geographic context (Ilam), using real-world data and exploring multifactorial correlates.

Reply: We are grateful to the reviewer for highlighting the novelty of our study, especially its focus on violence cases documented in police records from Ilam and the use of real-world data along with multifactorial correlates. Your valuable feedback motivates us to continue conducting practical and impactful research in this important area.

Title

Title Reflects Content: Yes. It clearly indicates the population (individuals with police records), location (Ilam), and subject matter (violence).

Abbreviation in Title: No abbreviations are used.

Abstract

Structured Abstract: Yes, includes Background, Methods, Results, and Conclusion.

Keywords from MeSH: Partially. "Violence" and "Police Stations" are relevant; however, keywords like "Ilam" may not align with MeSH and should be reconsidered for standardization.

Reply: Thank you for your valuable comment regarding the keywords. The keywords have been aligned with the MeSH system standards. These corrections were made in lines 27 and 28 of the manuscript.

Introduction

Objectives Clearly Stated: Yes. The aim to investigate the status and correlates of violence among individuals in police records is explicitly stated.

Includes What is Known, Not Known, and Aims: Yes. It reviews previous knowledge, identifies the research gap, and presents a well-defined aim.

Materials and Methods

Participant Selection Described: Yes. Random sampling of 400 cases from police records is clearly stated.

Study Design Described: Yes. Descriptive-analytical approach is mentioned.

Adequacy of the Sample: Yes. 400 participants are appropriate for this kind of epidemiological study.

Representativeness of Subjects: Generally yes, but limited to a specific locale (Ilam), which may limit generalizability.

Reply: Thank you for your valuable comment regarding the representativeness of the study sample. We acknowledge that limiting the sample to the city of Ilam may restrict the generalizability of the findings. Therefore, we have added a clear explanation of this limitation in the "Limitations" section to help readers interpret the results with this consideration in mind.

These revisions have been made in the "Limitations" section, lines 374 to 378.

We appreciate your constructive feedback, which has helped improve the clarity of our study.

Sample Size Calculation Provided: No formal sample size calculation or power analysis is mentioned.

Reply: Thank you for your valuable comment regarding the sample size calculation. We have now included a formal explanation of the sample size determination in the manuscript. Specifically, assuming an infinite population, an expected proportion of 0.5, a margin of error of 5%, and a 95% confidence level, the sample size was calculated as 384. Given that 400 participants were selected, the sample size is sufficient to ensure adequate statistical power. These revisions have been made in lines 111 to 119 of the manuscript.

Control Subjects Appropriate: Not applicable; this is an observational study without control/intervention arms.

Power of Study Declared: Not declared.

Reply: Thank you for your comment. The issue of statistical power has been addressed in Lines 118–129 of the revised manuscript, including justification for the sample size and its adequacy for detecting medium effect sizes with sufficient power.

Actual P-values Reported: Yes, *p*-values are reported throughout.

Blinding of Investigators: Not applicable or mentioned.

Reply: Thank you for your comment. As suggested, we have clarified this point in the manuscript. Given the observational and descriptive nature of the study and the absence of intervention or group assignment, blinding of investigators was not applicable. This has been added to the end of the "Data Collection Tools" subsection in lines 131–136 of the revised manuscript.

Blinding of Subjects: Not applicable.

Methods/Apparatus Identified with Manufacturer: No manufacturer details needed or provided.

Procedures Described for Reproducibility: Yes. Questionnaire-based data collection and statistical analysis methods are described in detail.

Drugs/Chemicals Used: Not applicable.

Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria Explained: Partially. Only general inclusion (case records related to violence) is stated.

Reply: Thank you for the comment. We have revised the manuscript to clearly define both inclusion and exclusion criteria. These additions have been made in lines 96–102 of the revised manuscript.

Statistical Analysis Appropriate: Yes. Chi-square, Pearson correlation, and Kendall's Tau-c were appropriately used.

Results

Tables and Figures: Tables are comprehensive, well-structured, and clearly present relationships between variables and types of violence.

Logical Presentation of Results: Yes. Results are presented in logical sequence with clear headings and explanations.

Data Duplication: No duplication detected.

Use of Technical Terms: Generally appropriate and statistically accurate.

Discussion

Conclusion Justified: Yes. The conclusions are supported by the results.

Analysis Supports Conclusion: Yes. Discussion is analytical and references previous research appropriately.

References

References Properly Written: Yes, format is consistent and professional.

Recent References: Yes. Many references are from 2020–2024, including the most recent studies in 2023–2025.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

Major Revision

EIC Decision:

Major Revision

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Nour-Mohammad Bakhshani : EIC

12 Jul 2025

Dear Authora,

The changes are acceptable, but the article is bulky. Summarize the introduction, discussion and limitation. Delete unnecessary content.

Regards,

EIC

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.

Reviewers' Comments:**Associate Editor's Comments:****EIC Decision:**

EIC 0:

Dear author,

The changes are acceptable,

Reply: Response: Thank you for confirming the previous changes. We are glad that the revisions have been accepted.

but the article is bulky.

Reply: Thank you for this important observation. We have carefully reviewed the manuscript and reduced the overall length by summarizing the Introduction, Discussion, and Limitations sections. Additionally, unnecessary or repetitive content has been removed to improve clarity and conciseness.

Summarize the introduction, discussion, and limitations.

Delete unnecessary content.

Reply: Thank you for your constructive comment. we have carefully reviewed and revised the manuscript to address the issue of length. The Introduction, Discussion, and Limitations sections have been significantly summarized while retaining the essential points and supporting references. Redundant and overly detailed content has been removed to enhance clarity and meet the journal's expectations.

All changes have been highlighted in green in the revised manuscript for your convenience.

Regards,

Uploaded Files by Reviewers/Associate Editor/ or EIC: Below, you can find the list of files attached by reviewers or associate editor or EIC during the review process (if any).

No file

Reviewer Assistant Comments:

These comments were generated by AI based on your manuscript. Please review them and consider incorporating the suggestions to enhance your article.

Reply: Thank you for your comments and suggestions. We have carefully reviewed the feedback and incorporated the relevant revisions in the updated manuscript to enhance the quality of the article.

Kind Regards,
Author Support Center,
Brieflands

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Nour-Mohammad Bakhshani : EIC

19 Jul 2025

Dear Author,

The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.

Thanks.