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.91614
Published in: International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction: 8(4); e91614

# Peer Review Report for "Smoking Cessation Education Program Among Automobile Factory Workers: An Interventional Study from Bam, Iran"

**Author(s):** Laleh Solaimanizadeh, Farkhondeh Amin Shokravi, Sedigheh Sadat Tavafian, Mohammad Gholami Fesharaki

## Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 15 Mar 2019
Revised Date: 22 Oct 2019
Accepted Date: 3 Nov 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)

11 May 2019

Dear AE,
This study attempts to evaluate the effects of an educational program on quitting smoking among automobile workers in Bam, Iran. Some major problems are:
- General comments
1- Authors need to proofread for grammar and spelling mistakes. The writing is stilted and poor. Lack of cohesion and coherence can be observed throughout the paper.
2- Authors need to write the manuscript clearly and concisely in line with scientific writing principles for reporting trials and following a logical order is needed to write all sections of the manuscript.
- Specific comments
Abstract
Background
1- Relevant background in line with the purpose of the study is needed.
Methods
1- State design of the study in the methods.
2- The abbreviation of TTM should be defined
3- explain the educational program in detail as possible.

4- What really is measured as outcome?
5- Give adequate information to support results e.g. in the results you mentioned the mean score of decisional-balance was…., however, decisional- balance, temptation, and change processes should be mentioned in the methods section.
6- State the type of statistical analyses used
Results
1- How many subjects included in the final analyses?
2- use the same approach throughout the manuscript e.g. once you mentioned “intervention group” and one time to “experimental group”
3- state the results in logical order as well as an informative format.
4- Since the study size is less than 100 per group, the numeric descriptions can be rounded to ONE decimal place.
5- polish the results section of the abstract until it is just right
Conclusion
1- What does it mean in terms of public health implication?
Methods
1- Write the methods in a logical order e.g. in line with CONSORT format. Use subheading if needed.
2- The authors mentioned the study is a quasi-experimental design, however, the study has both randomization and control group. I think it is a randomized controlled trial.
3- Which type of randomization is used in the study?
4- The study sample formula is suitable for two independent samples, however, the study groups are correlated over time.
5- Analyses are conducted by intention to treat or per protocol?
Results
1- Authors need to presented results in detail and follow a standard format.
2- Where exactly did you use the CI to evaluate statistical significance?
3- The presented results in Table 2 can be illustrated in the figure. By doing this reader can follow the score over time efficiently e.g. the interaction between time*group during the study period can be inferred.
4- What is “T”, “F” and “df” in Table 2? Explain those in the footnote of the Table.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 17 May 2019

Dear AE,
- Title
• What is a clinical study? Give reference?
• This article would benefit from close editing. I found it difficult to follow the authors’ argument duo to the many stylistic and grammatical errors.
- Abstract

• Write the complete form of “TTM” in the first use.
• Re-compute the changes of means. There are some errors.
- Background
• Reference 1 is old for the reported statistics.
• Check the order of references carefully.
- Methods
• Why is your study a quasi-experimental study? Give valid references.
• Revise Fig. 1. You are supposed to give reasons for drop-outs and others inside the text.
• Findings should report at the RESULT section, not at the METHODS. (Lines 105-9)
• Sample size needs to be revised according to the rate of drop-out.
• Where ANOVA has employed for the analyses?
• Explain the method used to generate the random allocation sequence.
• Explain the type of randomization.
• Who generated the random allocation sequence, who enrolled participants, and who assigned participants to interventions.
• If done, who was blinded after assignment to interventions (for example, participants, care providers, those assessing outcomes) and how?
- Results
• A table is needed to show baseline demographic and clinical characteristics for each group.
• Report for each primary and secondary outcome, results for each group, and the estimated effect size and its precision (such as 95% confidence interval).
• The two-way repeated-measures ANOVA should employ for comparing two groups.
• Use statistical tests to compare two groups in Table 1.
• There are some computational mistakes in the text and tables. Revise them.
Please highlight the revised sentences inside the manuscript.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 18 May 2019

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs a major revision.
Kind regards,
Associate Editor

**REFEREE**: EIC | **Revision** (0) 18 May 2019

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

**Dear Editor in Chief**

Thank you for giving this opportunity to revise the manuscript ID 91614 based on valuable comments of yours and respected reviewers. Below you can find the point by point responses to the peer review decision made by the editorial board members. We hope these corrections would be satisfactory. However, additional comments would be welcome.

Best regards,
Corresponding author

**Reviewers' Comments:**
*Reviewer 1:*
*Title*
• *What is a clinical study? Give reference?*

***- It was changed to interventional study***

• *This article would benefit from a close editing. I found it difficult to follow the authors' argument duo to the many stylistic and grammatical errors.*

***- This manuscript was edited again.***

*Abstract*
• *Write the complete form of "TTM" in the first use.*

***- It was written.***

• *Re-compute the changes of means. There are some errors.*

***- It was done.***

*Background*
• *Reference 1 is old for the reported statistics.*

***- It was changed to new one.***

• *Check the order of references carefully.*

***- It was done carefully. In this regard, the ref 6 was added in line 63 , the ref 40 was omitted from line 131, the ref 40 in line 239 was changed to 15.***

*Methods*
• *Why is your study a quasi-experimental study? Give valid reference.*

***- This was changed to interventional study.***

• *Revise Fig. 1. You are supposed to give reasons for drop-outs and others inside the text.*

***- It was done. The reasons for drop-outs and others were mentioned in the figure and inside the text.***

• *Findings should report at the RESULT section not at the METHODS. (Lines 105-9)*

***- It was done. These words transferred to result section (at beginning of it).***

• *Sample size needs to be revised according to the rate of drop-out.*

*-* ***Sample size is right. Considering 10% of calculated sample size (46.1* 10%= 4.6) for attrition, the total sample size has been calculated (46.1+4.6= 50.7) subjects. In this study after drop out, totally 50 subjects in each group has been studied.***

• *Where ANOVA has employed for the analyses?*

***- The reason was described in the method in statistical section.***

• *Explain the method used to generate the random allocation sequence.*

***- It was explained.***
• *Explain the type of randomization.*

***- It was explained in method.***

*• Who generated the random allocation sequence, who enrolled participants, and who assigned participants to interventions?*

***- These items were explained in method.***

*• If done, who was blinded after assignment to interventions (for example, participants, care providers, those assessing outcomes) and how?*

*-* ***- These items were explained in method.***

*Results*
*• A table is needed to show baseline demographic and clinical characteristics for each group.*

*- It was done in result.*

*• Report for each primary and secondary outcome, results for each group, and the estimated effect size and its precision (such as 95% confidence interval).*

***- It was reported in Tables 2 and 3.***

*• The two-way repeated measures ANOVA should employ for comparing two groups.*

***- It was done in results.***

*• Use statistical tests to compare two groups in Table 1.*

***- It was improved in results.***

*• There are some computational mistakes in the text and tables. Revise them.*

***- These were done.***

*Please highlight revised sentences inside the manuscript.*

***- The revised sentences were highlighted.***

*Reviewer 2:*
*This study attempts to evaluate the effects of an educational program on quitting smoking among automobile workers in Bam, Iran. Some major problems are:*

*General comments*
*-* ***Authors need to proofread for grammar and spelling mistakes. The writing is stilted and poor. Lack of cohesion and coherence can be observed throughout the paper.***

***- The manuscript was edited.***

***- Authors need to write the manuscript clearly and concisely in line of scientific writing principles for reporting trials and following a logical order is needed to write all section of manuscript.***

***- This was done.***

*Specific comments*
*Abstract*
*Background*

*- Relevant background in line of the purpose of the study is needed.*

***- The background is in the line of the purpose of the study which is a model based study.***

*Methods*
*- State design of the study in the methods.*

***- It was stated.***

*- Abbreviation of TTM should be defined*

***- It was defined.***

*- Explain educational program in detail as possible.*

***It was explained in details.***

*- What really is measured as outcome?*

***- It was mentioned in method as primary and secondary outcomes.***

*- Give adequate information to support results e.g. in the results you mentioned the mean score of decisional-balance were…., however, decisional- balance, temptation and change processes should be mentioned in the methods section.*

***- These variables were mentioned in the end of introduction and also in method where intervention sessions were described.***

*- State the type of statistical analyses used.*

***- The analyses were stated at the end of method and also in the tables.***

*Results*
*- How many subjects included in the final analyses?*

***- This was mentioned in the first section of results and tables.***

*- use the same approach throughout manuscript e.g. once you mentioned "intervention group" and one time to "experimental group"*

***- Yes. These variations were improved.***

*- state the results in logical order as well as an informative format.*

***- This was done.***

*- Since the study size is less than 100 per group, the numeric descriptions can be rounded to ONE decimal place.*

***- This was done.***
*- polish the results section of abstract until it is just right*

***- This was done.***

*Conclusion*

***- It was removed from conclusion.***

*Methods*

*- Write the methods in a logical order e.g. in line of CONSORT format. Use subheading if needed.*

***- It was written as mentioned.***

*- The authors mentioned the study is quasi-experimental design, however, the study have both randomization and control group. I think it is a randomized controlled trial.*

***It was changed to interventional study.***

*- Which type of randomization is used in the study?*

***- Random permutation blocking .***

*- The study sample formula is suitable for two independent samples, however, the study groups are correlated over time.*

***This correlation does not effect on sample size. Two groups are independent.***

*- Analyses is conducted by intention to treat or per protocol?*

***There is no huge attrition. Thus there was no need for intention to treat analyzes.***

*Results*

*- Authors need presented results in detail and follow a standard format.*

***- It was done. Table 1 was also added.***

*- Where exactly did you use the CI to evaluate statistical significance?*

***- It was mentioned in tables.***

*- The presented results in the Table 2 can be illustrated in figure. With doing this reader can follow the score over time efficiently e.g. the interaction between time*group during the study period can be inferred.*

***- It was done possibly.***

*- What is "T", "F" and "df" in the Table 2? Explain those in the footnote of the Table.*

***- These were explained in the footnote of the Table.***

**Associate Editor's Comments:**

*Associate Editor 1:*
*major revision*

**EIC Decision:**
*major revision*

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

| No file |
|---|

**How to Revise?**
Please sign in to the journal with your account and follow the instruction to resubmit your revised paper. With respect to time limits, we are looking forward to hearing from you soon in the mentioned time fram

**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**: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 13 Jul 2019

Dear AE,
Although the authors addressed the responses for my comments, however, I suggest that several minor issues can be considered for improving the article:
1- Please seek assistance from an editor to improve English grammar throughout
2- Please mention study design in the method section of the abstract
3- To the better readability, the Table of 2 of the article can be presented in a figure as a line of repeated measure design studies
4- Please mention limitations before the conclusion in the discussion
5- Please explain “PV”, “df” and “SD” in Table 2 in the footnote
6- Please write the detail of permuted block randomization e.g. a list of all permutations for the block size.
7- The name of statistical analysis software to be mention in the statistical analysis section of the method section
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 20 Jul 2019

Dear AE,
Most of the comments have corrected. However, there are some comments in Figure. 1 and Table 2 which need correction.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 22 Jul 2019

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,
Associate Editor

**REFEREE**: EIC | **Revision** (1) 22 Jul 2019

Dear author,

- The article is too long. Delete the same statements from different references and add them in one statement.
- Add the details of TTM in the table and abbreviate them.
- Add this related article:
http://jhrba.com/en/articles/19688.html
minor revision.
Thanks.

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.

*Dear Editor in Chief*

*International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction*

*Thank you for giving this opportunity to revise the manuscript ID -91614 entitled Smoking Cessation Education Program among Automobile Factory Workers: A clinical study from Bam, Iran*

*Based on valuable comments of yours and respected reviewers. Below you can find the point by point responses to the peer review decision made by the editorial board members. We hope these corrections would be satisfactory. However, additional comments would be welcome.*

*Best regards,*

*Reviewer 1:*

*Most of the comments have corrected. However, there are some comments in Fig. 1 and Table 2 which needs correction. You might find it in the text.*

Use two-way repeated measures ANOVA to compare groups and also different times

*In this study we used two-way repeated measures ANOVA. The df also revise in main text.*

*Reviewer 2:*
*Although the authors addressed the responses for my comments, however, I suggest that several minor issues can be considered for improving the article*
*- Please seek assistance from an editor to improve English grammar throughout*

*It is improved.*

*- Please mention study design in the method section of the abstract*

*It has been done*

*- To the better readability, the Table of 2 of the article can be presented in a figure as line of repeated measure design studies*

*It has been done*

*- Please mention limitations before conclusion in the discussion*

*Study limitation mentioned before conclusion.*

*- Please explain "PV", "df" and "SD" in the Table 2 in the footnote*

*It has been done*

*- Please write detail of permuted block randomization e.g. a list of all permutations for the block size.*

*It has been done*

*- The name of statistical analysis software to be mention in the statistical analysis section of method section*

*It has been done*

**OPEN PEER REVIEW**

**Revision (2)**

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

**REFEREE**: EIC | **Revision** (2) 17 Oct 2019

Dear author,

The changes are acceptable, but the article is too long yet.

- Delete the unnecessary paragraph.

Regards.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

## 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**

**Int J High Risk Behav Addict**

Thank you for this opportunity to revise again this manuscript ID. : 91614

According the view point of the editorial board of the journal, this manuscript was shortened mostly at introduction and discussion sections. We hope it would be acceptable.

**Corresponding author**

**OPEN PEER REVIEW**

**Revision (3)**

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

**REFEREE**: EIC | **Revision** (3) 3 Nov 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.