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

International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijhrba.89575
Published in: International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction: 9(2); e89575

Peer Review Report for "Individual and Social Predictors of HIV Status Disclosure in HIV-Positive Individuals in Ahvaz, Khuzestan, Southwest of Iran"

Author(s): Shirin Hasanpour, Mansoureh Fakhouri, Mojgan Mirghafourvand

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 21 Jan 2019
Revised Date: 14 Mar 2020
Accepted Date: 25 Apr 2020

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) — 25 May 2019

Daer AE,
My comments has been inserted in attached file.
1. This is a cross-sectional study based in South- East Iran, which is trying to determine the predictors of HIV status disclosure in HIV positive subjects. The issue is interesting and the study is to some extent well designed except for the statistical analysis.
2. Descriptive, analytical is not scientific terminology.
3. Since the aim of the study is prediction, it is highly recommended to use Multivariate linear regression instead of comparing the outcome variable based on sociodemographic characteristics.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 30 May 2019

Dear EIC,
One reviewer completed the above article. I agree with his suggestions. The researcher/s should consider recommendations and corrections. If so, the article will be acceptable.
Sincerely

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 30 May 2019

Dear Author,

Please revise the article grammatically, mention the ethical consideration, limitations, and your proposals, Add these related references:

http://jhrba.com/en/articles/69185.html

http://jhrba.com/en/articles/19649.html

regards,

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.

Dear Editor in Chief of International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction,

In response to reviewer valuable comments should be noted as following:

1.This is a cross-sectional study based in South- East Iran, which is trying to determine the predictors of HIV status disclosure in HIV positive subjects. The issue is interesting and the study is to some extent well designed except for the statistical analysis.

The statistical analysis was corrected.

2.Descriptive, analytical is not a scientific terminology.

That was corrected.

3.Since the aim of the study is prediction, it is highly recommended to use Multivariate linear regression instead of comparing the outcome variable based on sociodemographic characteristics.

The variables were entered into the multivariate linear regression model with backward strategy and the necessary amendments were made and highlighted accordingly.

EIC Decision:

revise the article grammatically

The article revised grammatically.

mention the ethical consideration.

The ethical consideration was written in method section and highlighted.

Limitations and your proposals

Limitations and future studies suggestions were added to the end of discussion section.

Add these related references
http://jhrba.com/en/articles/69185.html
http://jhrba.com/en/articles/19649.html
regards,

These references were added to text.

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 30 Mar 2020

Dear EIC,
Thanks to the authors for the revision based on the suggestions.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 25 Apr 2020

Dear Author,
Your article is accepted, add the ethical code in ethical consideration part, add the place of registration in Funding/Support in galley proof file.
regards,