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

Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijpbs.101858
Published in: Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 15(1); e101858

Peer Review Report for "Relationship between Obsessive-compulsive Disorder and Overactive Bladder Syndrome"

Author(s): Farzad Allameh, Mahtab Motamed, Mohammad Poury, Ali Tayyebiazar, Saleh Ghiasy, Morteza Fallah-Karkan, Saba Faraji, Seyyed Ali Hojjati

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 4 Apr 2020
Revised Date: 25 Jan 2021
Accepted Date: 26 Jan 2021

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) — 16 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
1. In the abstract, it is better to state briefly demographic information like the average age.
2. Characteristics of study participants (eg social, demographic,...) not explained.
3. In the part of some limitations, after the description it should be noted that due to the lack of collection the important and possible risk factors in both diseases, and lack of collection the complete demographic information and especially due to that this study not included men, as a result, this study not generalizable.
4. All references should be written in the format of this journal and DOI should be mentioned.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 22 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
Please see my review in the attached file.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 22 Jun 2020

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 major revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 22 Jun 2020

Dear Author,
Your paper has been evaluated by external peer reviewers. Please do your revisions according to the reviewers' comments. I appreciate you doing 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 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.

Hello editor in chief
Thank you for the comments
These are the answers to the reviewer's comments :

Reviewer 1 :

Comment 1 : In the abstract,itis better state briefly demografic information like the average age
Answer 1 : Done

Comment 2 : characteristics of study participants (eg social,demographic,...) not explained
Answer 2 : Participants' characteristics that interfered with the study were examined and eliminated like Patients with urinary infection and history of psychiatric disorders (except OCD) were excluded from the study.Subjects suffered from multiple sclerosis (MS), history of cerebrovascular accident, spinal cord stenosis, and history of pelvic organ radiation, and participants with an incomplete questionnaire and reluctance to enrol in the study were excluded.

Comment 3 : In the part of some limitations,after the discription it should be noted that, due to the lack of collection the important and possible risk factors in both diseases,and lack of collection the complet demographic information and specially due to that this study not included men,as a result,this study not generalizable
Answer 3 : Added to the manuscript

Comment 4 : All refreces should be written in the format of this journal and DOI should be mentioned

Answer 4 : corrected and added

Reviewer 2 :

Because the comments mentioned in the article in the word file, we answered the comments in the file , and highlighted them . the file has been uploaded .

Thank you

Dr.Saleh Ghiasy

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) 17 Jul 2020

Dear EIC,
Thanks for the recent revisions.
Although the referee finds some merit in the paper, substantial revisions are required before we can consider it further.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 17 Jul 2020

Dear Author,
Thank you for your recent revisions.
Your paper has now been evaluated again. According to the reviewer's and associate editor's comments, it needs some more revisions. Please do your revisions according to these 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.
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.

Hello editor in chief

I answered the comments one by one, as you mentioned before.

You asked for the journal standards. I checked. Our manuscript is compatible with the journal standards.

If it is not ok, could you please specify with part is not ok?

These are the answers to the comments one by one:

Comment 1 (Line 12): happen less frequently

Answer 1 : I changed the word (happen) to (occur).

Comment 2 (Line 12): Move this sentence to the "Objectives" of the abstract.
Answer 2 : Corrected . We moved it to the objectives part of abstract.

Comment 3 (Line 19): Remove this section from the article abstract.
Answer 3 : Corrected.

Comment 4 (Line 21): It is recommended to modify this way.
Answer 4 : Corrected

Comment 5 (Line 35) This sentence is repetitive. Please remove it.
Answer 5 : Corrected

Comment 6 (Line 38) : This sentence is incomprehensible.
Answer 6 : Corrected to this form : About the Y-BOCS total score, there is a significant difference between patients with obsessive traits and the control group's participants (P < 0.001).

Comment 7 (Line 47) : Which part of the results is this conclusion related to?
Answer 7 : Y-BOCS score was higher in OAB patients rather than the control group, and OCD is 6.23 times more frequent in OAB patients

Comment 8 (Line 48) : Conclusion must be related to the results.

Answer 8 : Corrected

Comment 9 (Line 53) : Keywords should be matched with MeSH. Please use keywords which exist in MeSH. You can use the following address: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/
Answer 9 : Corrected : overactive detrusor ; obsessive compulsive disorder ; overactive bladder ; urodynamic

Comment 10 (Line 59) : References should be numbered in the order in which they appear in the text.
Answer 10 : All the references has been revised and corrected.

Comment 11 (Line 93) : Remove this sentence
Answer 11 : Corrected

Comment 12 (Line 109) : to rate the severity of OCD symptoms
Answer 12 : Corrected

Comment 13 (Line 121) : You have not matched these variables. You have excluded these patients.
Answer 13 : Corrected

Comment 14 (Line 130) : You have conducted a case-control study.
Answer 14 : Corrected

Comment 15 (Line 132) : Please mention the psychometric properties of Persian version of OAB-V8.
Answer 15 : Persian version of OAB-V8 is used to determine the severity of OAB characteristics on patients and do not have psychometric features

Comment 16 (Line 140) : Please mention the psychometric properties of Persian version of Y-BOCS.
Answer 16 : The Yale-Brown Obsessive-Compulsive Scale (Y-BOCS) is a clinician-administered instrument, developed in 1989 to assess the presence and severity of obsessive-compulsive symptoms . It is divided into a symptom checklist and a severity scale. The symptom checklist comprises 54 dichotomous items assessing current or prior presence of specific obsessions and compulsions. The severity scale consists of 10 items that

quantify the impact of obsessions and compulsions identified using the symptom checklist. These 10 items are 5-point Likert-type scales characterizing the time spent on compulsions (item 1), interference from obsessions (item 2), distress associated with obsessions (item 3), resistance to obsessions (item 4), subject's control over obsessions (item 5) and equivalent items for compulsions (items 6–10). The Y-BOCS has shown good psychometric properties and sensitivity to the therapeutic effects of medication and psychotherapy

Comment 17 (Line 141) : This sentence is incomprehensible.
Answer 17 : Corrected

Comment 18 (Line 148) : Obtaining a code of ethics is essential for all studies. If you have not already done so, take action now.
Answer 18 : By the time we performed this study it was not necessary to get the ethical code.

Comment 19 (Line 164) : Remove this unnecessary sentence.
Answer 19 : Corrected

Comment 20 (Line 173) : This sentence is incomprehensible
Answer 20 : Corrected to this form : This method was used based on the previous research, which demonstrated two points : (a) with a proper clinical evaluation, obsessions and compulsions exist simultaneously, and (b) they have the same score of severity in the Y-BOCS

Comment 21 (Line 189) : It is not necessary to mention this sentence here.
Answer 21 : Corrected

Comment 22 (Line 220) : Uptake or reuptake?
Answer 22 : Reuptake . Corrected

Comment 23 (In the table) : When it comes to jobs, “home maker” is used.
Answer 23 : Corrected

Thank you for your comments.
Dr.Saleh Ghiasy

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: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 29 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
Most bugs in the article have been fixed. But there are still some bugs left. Please see the attached review file.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 29 Aug 2020

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,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 29 Aug 2020

Dear Author,
Thank you for your recent revisions.
Your paper has now been evaluated again. According to the reviewers' and associate editor's comments it needs some more revisions. Please do your revisions according to these 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.
Thanks.

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.

Hello editor in chief

These are the answers to the comments one by one:

Comment 1 : Please mention the following article to refer for psychometric properties of the Persian version of OAB-V8:
Sevil Hakimi, Roghayeh Dargahi, Noushin Mobaraki Asl, Minoo Ranjbar, Marzieh Mohammadi, Fariba Nikan, Hamed NedaieIranian Version of Overactive Bladder Symptom Scale: A Methodological Study. Crescent Journal of Medical and Biological Sciences. Vol. 5, No. 4, October 2018, 366–370

Answer 1 : Done

Comment 2 : Please mention the psychometric properties of Persian version of Y-BOCS in the text of the manuscript.
Answer 2 : Done

Comment 3 : This sentence is incomprehensible yet.

Answer 3 : I delete that sentence. It was not necessary to the manuscript

Comment 4 : Publication of articles without an ethics code is prohibited by a directive of the Ministry of Health. You can request a code of ethics from your university's vice chancellor for research.

Answer 4 : It was not a clinical trial study and we didn’t perform any intervention in the study. The UDS was part of patients routine diagnosis procedure. By the time we performed this study it was not necessary to get the ethical code. Patients did not pay any additional fee.

Thank you

Dr.Ghiasi

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (3) 24 Sep 2020

Dear EIC,
Thanks for the recent revisions.
This paper has now been evaluated again by external peer reviewers. Unfortunately, the authors have not done all of the requested revisions.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (3) 24 Sep 2020

Dear Author,
Thank you for your recent revisions.
Your paper has now been evaluated again. According to the reviewers' and associate editor's comments, it needs some more revisions. Please do your revisions according to these green highlighted comments. I appreciate you doing the revisions as soon as possible by using the track changes mode in MS Word and using colored text.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (4)

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 editor in chief

Thank you for your comments

These are the answers to the comments :

Comment 1 : Psychometric properties are characteristics of tests and other measures of human characteristics that identify and describe attributes of an instrument, such as its reliability or appropriateness for use in a particular circumstance.
Please explain the psychometric properties (validity and reliability (validity and reliability coefficients) of the questionnaire. Not just the reference number.

Answer 1 : Highlighted in the manuscript. The validity of OAB-V8 was evaluated by concurrent related validity. It means that each participant filled ICIQ- OAB along with OAB-V8.
The reliability of OAB-V8 was also assessed by internal consistency and reproducibility. For assessment of internal consistency, Cronbach α was calculated.
The calculated optimal levels of internal consistency scores for Q1 (frequency) was 0.77 and for Q2 (nocturia) was 0.74 and for Q3 (urgency) was 0.76 and for Q4(urgency incontinence) was 0.78.
Correlation Coefficient for Q1 (frequency) was 0.83 and for Q2 (nocturia) was 0.84 and for Q3 (urgency) was 0.79 and for Q4(urgency incontinence) was 0.71.
To determine the reproducibility, test re-test method was used. The questionnaire was completed 2 times during the 10 days by 30 individuals.
Persian version of OAB-V8 had an acceptable validity and reliability

Comment 2 : Please explain the psychometric properties (validity and reliability (validity and reliability coefficients) of the questionnaire.

Answer 2 : Highlighted in the manuscript. The Yale-Brown Obsessive-Compulsive Scale (Y-BOCS) is a clinician-administered instrument, developed in 1989 to assess the presence and severity of obsessive-compulsive symptoms . It is divided into a symptom checklist and a severity scale. The symptom checklist comprises 54 dichotomous items assessing current or prior presence of specific obsessions and compulsions. The severity scale consists of 10 items that quantify the impact of obsessions and compulsions identified using the symptom checklist. These 10 items are 5-point Likert-type scales characterizing the time spent on compulsions (item 1), interference from obsessions (item 2), distress associated with obsessions (item 3), resistance to obsessions (item 4), subject's control over obsessions (item 5) and equivalent items for compulsions (items 6–10). The Y-BOCS has shown good psychometric properties and sensitivity to the therapeutic effects of medication and psychotherapy.
Y- Bocs has been translated and validated in persian. The calculated optimal levels of internal consistency scores for symptom checklist was 0.97 and for severity scale was 0.95. Split-half reliability for symptom checklist was 0.93, and for severity scale was 0.89 and test-retest reliability was 0.99.

Comment 3 : Descriptive and analytical articles also need an ethics committee code. Please pay attention to the attached letter of the Deputy Minister of Research.

Answer 3 : The ethical code is : IR.SBMU.RETECH.REC.1399.863 .

Thank you

Dr.Ghiasy

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (4)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (4) 15 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
Thanks to the authors for making the corrections. But a few minor notes remain that can be seen in the attachment.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (4) 15 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,
Thanks to the authors for their recent revisions.
Their paper has now been evaluated again. According to the reviewers' and associate editor's comments, it needs some more revisions.
Thanks.

Mehran Zarghami: EIC | **Revision** (4) 15 Jan 2021

Dear Author,
This is with further reference to your paper submitted for possible publication in IJPBS.
Your paper has been carefully reviewed and it is suggested that the manuscript requires considerable revision and should be modified according to the reviewers' comments which are appended below.
If you can satisfactorily reply to all the points raised by the reviewers, we would be pleased to consider a revised manuscript for further review. With your revised version, kindly upload an annotated list addressing each of the reviewers' comments and highlighting where changes have been made to the manuscript. This will facilitate and accelerate our assessment of the revised paper.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (5)

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 editor in chief

Thank you for your comments

These are the answers to the comments :

Comment 1 : Given that a new edition of this book has been published, please replace this reference with a new edition:
American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders. Fifth edition (DSM-5). Washington: The Institute; 2013.

Answer 1 : Done

Comment 2 : Edit

Answer 2 : The references has been edited

Comment 3 : Also write the test-retest reliability coefficient.

Answer 3 : **Test Re-test Reliability (95% CI)** for Q1 (frequency) was 0.78 and for Q 2 (nocturia) was 0.81 and for Q3 (urgency) was 0.70 and for Q4(urgency incontinence) was 0.73

Comment 4 : Edit

Answer 4 : The references has been edited

Comment 5 : Citation Needed.

Answer 5 : Done

Comment 6 : Edit

Answer 6 : Done

Comment 7 : Figure legends should be self-explanatory. The legend should incorporate definitions of any symbols used and all abbreviations and units of measurement should be explained so that the figure and its legend are understandable with minimal reference to the text.

Answer 7 : Corrected to this : Comparision of severity of Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder based on Y-BOCS scale in two groups : Patients with Over-Active Bladder (OAB) symptoms and the control-group

Comment 8 : Edit please.

Answer 8 : Done

Comment 9 : Figure legends should be self-explanatory. The legend should incorporate definitions of any symbols used and all abbreviations and units of measurement should be explained so that the figure and its legend are understandable with minimal reference to the text.

Answer 9 : Corrected to this : The correlation between Over-Active Bladder (OAB) symptoms based on OAB-V8 scale, and severity of Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder (OCD) based on Y-BOCS scale in patients with OAB symptoms

Comment 10 : Edit please.

Answer 10 : Done

Comment 11 : Tables should be so constructed that they, together with their captions and legends, will be intelligible with minimal reference to the text.

Answer 11 : Results of basic variables (age, occupation and education) in patients with Over-Active Bladder symptoms and the Control-group

Comment 12 : What does OAD stand for?

Answer 12 : It was OAB. Corrected

Comment 13 : Tables should be so constructed that they, together with their captions and legends, will be intelligible with minimal reference to the text.

Answer 13 : The correlation between Over-Active Bladder (OAB) and Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder (OCD) (Y-BOCS score>20) adjusted for age

Comment 14 : All abbreviations should be defined in footnoted in all tables.

Answer 14 : Done and added to the manuscript

Comment 15 : Given that a new edition of this book has been published, please replace this reference with a new edition:

American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders. Fifth edition (DSM-5). Washington: The Institute; 2013.

Answer 15 : Done and corrected

Comment 16 : Please add DOI.

Answer 16 : This article does not have DOI. The URL is : http://ijpcp.iums.ac.ir/article-1-1453-en.html

Comment 17 : This is an incomplete reference. If it is an article, add the name and number of the journal and the number of pages.

Answer 17 : Corrected

Thank you

From corresponder

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (5)

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

Mehran Zarghami: EIC | **Revision (5)** 26 Jan 2021

Dear Author,
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.