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.91295
Published in: International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction: 8(3); e91295

Peer Review Report for "Effects of Adverse Early-Life Experiences on Sexually Transmitted Infections Among Homeless Women"

Author(s): Arezoo Fallahi, Azam Rahmani, Seyed Ali Azin, Nader Molavi, Peter Higgs, Leila Allahqoli

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 6 Mar 2019
Revised Date: 27 Aug 2019
Accepted Date: 31 Jul 2019

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) — 26 Jun 2019

Dear AE,
This article needs some minor revisions, which are uploaded as a separate file.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 9 Jul 2019

Dear AE,
This manuscript is perfect and all right in different aspects. The only remarkable point is that the abstract section is rather long and it is better to be shortened slightly.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 15 Jul 2019

Dear EIC,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
- Revise the article according to the comments.
- Short the manuscript.

- Add the code number of thesis in the method part.
regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)**

15 Jul 2019

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor 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.

Reviewer Number	Original comments of the reviewer	Reply by the author(s)	Changes done on page number and line number
1.	…..the abstract section is rather long and it is better to be shortened slightly.	It was done	Page 2, abstract section
2.	you can replace this part with 'adverse early life experiences " or "high-risk early life experiences"	Thanks for your comment. We changed high risk experiences during adolescences to adverse early life experiences	In title, object and body of the paper.
	The abstract is too long. It should be between 250-350 words.	The abstract part was shorted	Page 2
	at the topic you didn't say any thing about childhood. revise this	It was revised.	Page 2, line 7
	why you add "d" to "sighe'"?	Thanks for your comment, I was revised.	In abstract part, method, result. Every parts there was sighed changed to sighe
	how you conclude this? do you have any group of women who weren't homeless? or have a reference base in literature?	We revised the conclusion, we wrote this part based on our findings	Page 2/ line 25-28
	HIV is a type of STIs! don't mention that separately.	It was revised	Page 2/ line 28.
	Recommending condom use.	It was revised	Page 2/ line 28 Page 9/ line 216
	Key words are not MeSHTerms. replace them.	We replaced them based on MeSH Terms.	Page 2/ line 29
	Explain ethical issues and how to encourage people to participate in the study.	Thank you for your comments. We add ethical consideration at the end of methods part We wrote how encourage them to participate in our study	Page 5/ line 106 Page 5/line 110-111 Page 10/ line 218-222

	explain this below the table	It was explained under the table	Page 7/ table 3
	explain about association between STIs and age for onset of..... based on this table.	It was explained	Page 7/ line 147-148
	where is your verb?	Discussion was revised, shorted, and this part omitted.	
Associate Editor's Comments:	revise the article according to the comments.	This paper revised according to the comments	
	short the manuscript	It was shorted	
	add the code number of thesis in the method part.	We add the cod number at the end of manuscript, in Acknowledgement part.	Page 10/ line 226

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)** 31 Jul 2019

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