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.97530
Published in: International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction: 9(3); e97530

Peer Review Report for "Genital Warts Among Men Attending a Dermatology Clinic: Risk Factors and Knowledge"

Author(s): Nasrin Motazedian, Mehrab Sayadi, Shohreh Beheshti

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 7 Sep 2019
Revised Date: 15 Apr 2020
Accepted Date: 27 May 2020

Revision (0)

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

Haider Abdul-Lateef Mousa: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 4 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
- The Running title “Quality of life amongst liver transplantation recipients” is unrelated to the title of the article that should be changed.
Abstract
- The first sentence of “Objectives” should be arranged as a “Background”.
- Materials and Methods are insufficient to achieve the objective of the study. Many unrelated parameters, such as alcohol consumption and cigarette smoking, were included.
- The main methodological defect in the study is lack of control group.
Results
- The aim of the study (risk factors) has not been fulfilled vigorously from the supplemented data.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 29 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
The title is different from the research, authors should add more variables to access the aim

of study unless it can accept as a brief report. it sounds that they consider high-risk factors no risk behaviors.
regards,

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 16 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
The authors should do a major revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 16 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
The authors have performed the study to have a better understanding of the risk factors contributing to high HPV rates. Overall the topic paper is important both from clinical viewpoint and public health impact, but I have several concerns and comments:
- The background and conclusion in the abstract does not provide a clear conclusion in line with the objective of the study.
- In the Introduction, much more information is needed the topic of the study.
- The study aimed to investigate the risk factors contributing to high HPV rates, however, it seems there is no enough power for statistical analysis.
- The formula for sample size and parameters is nessecary for associational study or at least to mentioned a rational for recruiting 224 men with AGW
- I confused when the authors used chi-square test. Whey the authors did not used regression analyses to estimate effect measures?
- What was the reason for selection of a specific dermatological clinic?
- Table 3 is not self-standing and number (%) and mean score are meaningless according to patients and sex partner. Table 1 and 2 can to be merged.
- Your study design is a cross-sectional, the limitation of the study should be mentioned in the discussion in a better manner e.g. limited sample size
- There are some grammatical errors and the language needs to be edited.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 18 Feb 2020

Dear EIC,
The article has some problems.
if they would be solved, the article is considered as a brief report article.
regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 18 Feb 2020

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
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:

Hello, Dear reviewers,

Thank you for useful comments

Reviewer 1:
The Running title "Quality of life amongst liver transplantation recipients" is unrelated to the title of article that should be changed.
Response: You are right; it is a mistake. The correct running title is: **Risk behaviors of men with genital warts**

Abstract
The first sentence of "Objectives" should be arranged as a "Background".
Response: It is modified.

Materials and Methods are insufficient to achieve the objective of the study. Many unrelated parameters, such as alcohol consumption and cigarette smoking, were included.
The main methodological defect in the study is lack of control group.
Response: Literature review showed the participants having unprotected sex under the influence of alcohol or drug consumption. (for example reference 1,5)
Lack of control group was one of our limitation.

R*esults*
The aim of the study (risk factors) has not been fulfilled vigorously from the supplemented data.
Response: The r**isk factors for HPV infection include: Number of sexual partners. The more sexual partners you have, the more likely you are to contract a genital HPV infection. Having sex with a partner who has had multiple sex partners also increases your risk.**
A systematic review by María Inmaculada Rodríguez-Álvar mentioned: The risk factors for HPV infection are sexual promiscuity, early sexual debut, absence of circumcision, lack of condom use and smoking
So we included age of first sexual intercourse, unprotected sex after opioid, stimulants usage, and consumption of alcohol, number of sex partners in the past six months, type of sex partner, type of sex as risk factors for HPV.

Reviewer 2:
The authors should do a major revision.
Response: The revision was done
Reviewer 3:
the title is different from the research
add more variables to access the aim of study unless it can acceptable as brief report.
it sounds that you consider high risk factors no risk behaviors
Response: We changed the title

Reviewer 4:
The authors have performed the study to have a better understanding of the risk factors contributing to

high HPV rates. Overall the topic paper is important both from clinical viewpoint and public health impact, but I have several concerns and comments:

- The background and conclusion in the abstract does not provide a clear conclusion in line with the objective of the study.
Response: The revision was done

- In the Introduction, much more information is needed the topic of the study.
Response: The revision was done

- The study aimed to investigate the risk factors contributing to high HPV rates, however, it seems there is no enough power for statistical analysis.
- The formula for sample size and parameters is nessecary for associational study or at least to mentioned a rational for recruiting 224 men with AGW
Response: The dermatology clinic was the only center for cryotherapy in governmental ward. We did not use sample size formula, the men who came in time period of our study for cryotherapy was included in our study through convince sampling.

- I confused when the authors used chi-square test. Whey the authors did not used regression analyses to estimate effect measures?
Response: This is a cross sectional study, we included all of men with genital wart that was referred for cryotherapy.
We did not have control group, so we could not use regression model. The main aim was describing the characters and risk factors of this population. T test and Pearson correlation was used in this study, and chi-square test was deleted in text. (It was a mistake)

- What was the reason for selection of a specific dermatological clinic?
Response: This was the only governmental dermatology clinic, (referral center for cryotherapy) that we accessed to the patients. In private ward the interview was impossible.

- Table 3 is not self-standing and number (%) and mean score are meaningless according to patients and sex partner. Table 1 and 2 can to be merged.
Response: According to your comment, we merged table 1 and 2.
Table 3: Mean score of knowledge is obtained according patients response, that it is mentioned in methods part." STI knowledge included whether the respondents were aware of symptoms, transmission route and STI prevention methods. They had to answer 8 items using true/false. If their answers were correct, it scored one and zero if not. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 78%."

- Your study design is a cross-sectional, the limitation of the study should be mentioned in the discussion in a better manner e.g. limited sample size
Response: The limitation was added.

- There are some grammatical errors and the language needs to be edited.

Response: The revision was done

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)** 16 Mar 2020

Dear Author,
The article has some problems, if they would be solved, the article is considered as a brief report article.
regards,

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.

Hello, Dear

I changed the article format as brief report based on **EIC decision.**

Kindest Regards;

Nasrin Motazedian MD

Assistant Professor of Community Medicine

Shiraz Transplant Research Center

Shiraz Unversity of Medical Sciences

Shiraz, Iran

Tel/Fax: +98-713-6281529

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) 27 May 2020

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