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://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijpbs.101535
Published in: Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 14(3); e101535

Peer Review Report for "Effectiveness of Exposure/Response Prevention plus Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing in Reducing Anxiety and Obsessive-Compulsive Symptoms Associated with Stressful Life Experiences: A Randomized Controlled Trial"

Author(s): Mohammad Ebrahim Sarichloo, Farhad Taremian, Behrooz Dolatshahi, Seyed Alireza Haji Seyed Javadi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	28 Mar 2020
Revised Date:	2 May 2020
Accepted Date:	19 Jun 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) — 1 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

Imaneh Abasi: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 3 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript yields valuable information about the better effectiveness of ERP plus EMDR protocol compared to the ERP alone in patients with OCD with a history of stressful

life events and resistance to medication.
Title: It is not clear the participants are patients with OCD symptoms in the title.
Method:
1. What was the cut-off point for a minimum of SLE? It is said according to the Traumatic Experiences Questionnaire (TEC), but it is not clear how the minimum of SLEs is determined?
2. Some of the criteria mentioned in the exclusion section are inclusion criteria like the existence of a comorbid disorder (Any kind of psychological or medical disorder) now or in the past, except secondary depression, and with subclinical characteristics following OCD, and Substance and alcohol abuse. In other words, the circumstances which make the participant be ruled out of the study after the beginning of a study/or during the study are considered exclusion criteria as suicidal ideation/plan, or missing sessions.
3. The randomization procedure/technique should be explained.
4. Psychometric properties of questionnaires lack some information as the developer (Traumatic Experience Checklist (TEC)), and Iranian psychometric properties of most questionnaires.
5. Reference of Marr protocol is not mentioned.
Results:
1. In table 2, one of the variables is BDI. I think it is wrongly written. It is probably BAI.
2. Mean and SD of study variables are not mentioned.
3. It is better to use MANCOVA when comparing more than one variable between the two groups.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 6 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
I `ve reviewed the article entitled" Effectiveness of Exposure/Response Prevention(ERP) plus Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing(EMDR) in reducing anxiety and obsessive-compulsive symptoms associated with stressful life experiences: A randomized controlled trial ". and some major concerns have been raised for me which are mentioned below:
- The title should be changed: Effectiveness of Exposure/Response Prevention(ERP) plus Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing(EMDR) in treatment of obsessive-compulsive disorder associated with stressful life experiences: A randomized controlled trial
- The manuscript must be edited by a native English editor. It is written "OCD Patients" but this words should be replaced by "patients with OCD".
- Meaningful difference in page 4 should be replaced by significant difference.
- Validity and reliability of the Persian version of scales used in the study should be mentioned.
- Please add the information regarding funding/support.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 6 Apr 2020

Dear EIC,
Please revise your article according to the reviewers` comments.

Thanks

Mehran Zarghami: EIC | **Revision (0)** 18 Apr 2020

Dear Authors,
Your paper has been evaluated by external peer reviewers. Please do your revisions according to the reviewers' comments. I appreciate you to do the revisions as soon as possible by using the track changes mode in MS Word and using colored text.
After revision authors are obliged to upload reviewers' comments word file in which they have replied to all comments one by one.
Besides, please pay attention to the word count limitation: Word Count (including references and title page) should not be more than 3500 words. Original articles' maximum number of references is 55, maximum Number of illustrations/Tables is 5. Otherwise, you should pay extra charge to the publisher.
Word count limits are declared in this link: http://kowsarpub.com/en/index.php/services/for-authors/895-word-count
We look forward to receiving your revised manuscript. Thank you for sending your work to the Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences.
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 3:

Dear Reviewer

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript. We also thank you for your excellent comments and suggestions. The text of the article has been modified according to the suggestions and recommendations:

Title:

Q[1]: The manuscript yields valuable information about better effectiveness of ERP plus EMDR protocol compared to the ERP alone in patients with OCD with a history of stressful life events and resistance to medication.

Title: It is not clear the participants are patients with OCD symptoms in the title

R[1]The title of the change was applied:

Effectiveness Exposure/Response Prevention (ERP) plus Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing (EMDR) protocol compared to the ERP alone in patients with OCD with a history of stressful life events and resistance to medication.

Method:

Q[1]: *What was cut off point for a minimum of SLE? It is said according to the Traumatic Experiences Questionnaire (TEC), but it is not clear how the minimum of SLEs is determined?*

R[1]: *The purpose of using Traumatic Experiences Questionnaire (TEC) is to screen and ensure that there is at least one traumatic / stressful experience that affects a person's life before the onset of the disorder, not to measure it. Therefore, there was no need to report its psychometric properties. As there was no need to report the medications used by the patient over the past 6 months and the treatment did not respond well, ensuring that this was sufficient as a criterion for drug resistance.*

Q[2]: *Some of the criteria mentioned in the exclusion section are inclusion criteria like the existence of a comorbid disorder (Any kind of psychological or medical disorder) now or in the past, except secondary depression, and with subclinical characteristics following OCD, and Substance and alcohol abuse. In other words, the circumstances which make the participant be ruled out of the study after the beginning of a study/or during the study are considered as exclusion criteria as suicidal ideation/plan, missing sessions.*

R[2]: *The study inclusion and exclusion criteria were corrected.*

Q[3]: *The randomization procedure/technique should be explained.*

R[3]: *The randomization method was described in the text of the article.*

Q[4]: *Psychometric properties of questionnaires lack some information as the developer (Traumatic Experience Checklist (TEC)), and Iranian psychometric properties of most questionnaires.*

R[4]: *Psychometric properties were reported in the Iranian version of the scales.*

Q[5]: *Reference of Marr protocol is not mentioned.*

R[5]: *Reference of Marr protocol was mentioned.*

Results:

Q[1]: *In table 2, one of the variables is BDI. I think it is wrongly written. It is probably BAI.*

R[1]: *The BDI was properly changed to BAI.*

Q[2]: *Mean and SD of study variables are not mentioned.*

R[2]: *The mean and standard deviation of the scores of the variables studied in the pre-test, post-test and follow-up were added to Table 2.*

Q[3]: *It is better to use MANCOVA when comparing more than one variable between the two groups.*

R[3]: *ANCOVA is used.*

Reviewer 4:

Dear Reviewer

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript. We also thank you for your excellent comments and suggestions. The text of the article has been modified according to the suggestions and recommendations:

Q[1]: The title should be changed: Effectiveness of Exposure/Response Prevention(ERP) plus Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing(EMDR) in treatment of obsessive-compulsive disorder associated with stressful life experiences: A randomized controlled trial.

R[1]: "Effectiveness Exposure/Response Prevention(ERP) plus Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing(EMDR) protocol compared to the ERP alone in patients with OCD with a history of stressful life events and resistance to medication".

Q[2]: The manuscript must be edited by a native English editor. It is written "OCD Patients" but this words should be replaced by "patients with OCD".

R[2]: The term "OCD Patients" was changed to "patients with OCD"

Q[3]: Meaningful difference in page 4 should be replaced by significant difference.

R[3]: "Meaningful difference" replaced by "significant difference".

Q[4]: Validity and reliability of the Persian version of scales used in the study should be mentioned.

R[4]: Psychometric properties were reported in the Iranian version of the scales.

Q[5]: Please add the information regarding funding/support.

R[5]: funding / support information was added.

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) 27 May 2020

Dear EIC,
Thanks for revising the article.
On page 4 , BDI must be changed to BAI.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 19 Jun 2020

Dear Authors,
We have completed our review of your manuscript and are pleased to inform you that it is considered for publication in the IJPBS. Note that the publication of your article will only be finalized upon your cooperation with the editorial processing.
Thank you for your fine contribution. On behalf of the Editors of IJPBS, we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.
Thanks