**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.104682
Published in: Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 15(3); e104682

# Peer Review Report for "Predictive Model of High-risk Behaviors in Iranian Male Adolescents Based on Psychological Motivation"

**Author(s):** Sajad Aminimanesh, Ali Asghar Hayat, Mostafa Khanzadeh, Mahdi Taheri

## Review Timeline:

| | |
|---|---|
| Submit Date: | 9 May 2020 |
| Revised Date: | 2 May 2021 |
| Accepted Date: | 15 May 2021 |

**Revision (0)**

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

**Elham Shirazi**: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 6 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
Well-written article and good subject.
Comments for the authors:
1. Because the sample was all-male, it is better to mention it in the title: Predictive Model of High-Risk Behaviors in Male Adolescents Based on Psychological Motivation
2. In the abstract section "AMOS" and any abbreviation in other parts of the article has to be completely written for the first time.
3. Demographic characteristics of the sample have to be mentioned in the result.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 22 Mar 2021

Dear AE,
The authors can see my review in the appended file.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 22 Mar 2021

Dear EIC,
This is with further reference to the paper submitted for possible publication in IJPBS.
This paper has been carefully reviewed and it is suggested that the manuscript requires minor revision and should be modified according to the reviewers' comments which are appended below.
Thanks.

**Mehran Zarghami**: EIC | **Revision (0)** 22 Mar 2021

Dear Authors,
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.

**Dear Reviewers**

**Thanks for the valuable comments**

**The requested comments were applied to the article.**

| Reviewer comments | Authors responses |
|---|---|
| The study was only on adolescent boys. Also, because high-risk behaviors vary in different societies, write "Iranian male Adolescents." | Done |
| The structured abstract is required including these headings:<br>• **Background**<br>• **Objectives**<br>• **Methods**<br>• **Results**<br>• **Conclusions** | Done |
| What AMOS stands for? Please define the abbreviation. | AMOS is the name of software and stands for these words: Analysis of moment structures. It is uncommon to use all of these words.<br>However, according to the reviewer, the full phrase can be used |
| Since the predictor variables of the model have not been mentioned before, the reader does not understand what factors had significant relationship with high-risk behaviors. | Done |
| A list of three to five keywords should be included below the abstract in alphabetical order, and should be taken from those recommended by the US National Library of Medicine's Medical Subject Headings (MESH) browser list. You can use the following address: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/<br>If suitable MESH terms are not yet available for recently introduced terms, present terms may be used. | Done<br>The following keywords were selected according to the instructions.<br>**Adolescent**<br>**Risk-Taking**<br>Motivation |
| Various researchers have studied this before, including Mokhtarnia et al. (21), Mohammadi et al. (22), Tao et al. (23), Thornberry et al. (24), Draucker and Mazurczyk (25), and Johnson et al. (26). Please explain about the novelty of your study. | Done<br>The researches of Mokhtarinia et al (21) and Mohammadi et al (22) has not been conducted specifically on motivations. Therefore, these two references were replaced by Sehat and Aminimanesh (2020) and Hoseini and Aminimanesh (2019).<br>The first was carried out on females and the second only on drug use. So, no study was found that examined the psychological motivations for high-risk behaviors in Iranian male adolescents. |
| Common abbreviations may be used without definition. Terms appearing frequently (three or more times) within a paper may be abbreviated, but should be spelled out at first citation, with the abbreviation following in parentheses. | Done |
| Please mention the psychometric properties of the Persian version of this scale. | Done<br>A reference was also added |
| Please explain about the implementation steps of the study. Where did the subjects fill out the | Done<br>Requested items were added to the text in two parts |

| | |
|---|---|
| questionnaires? Were the questionnaires anonymous? Were they paper based or electronic? If it was electronics, in what space was it sent and collected? If they were paper based, who distributed the questionnaires? How were the questionnaires collected? Also explain about the calculation of sample size and sampling method and inclusion and exclusion criteria.<br>Also explain about the confidentiality and other ethical considerations briefly. | and highlighted in yellow (In this paragraph and the paragraph before the measures). |
| Captions should briefly explain the tables should be understandable without reference to the text. It is not appropriate about table 1. | Done |
| You have not mention these variables anywhere. | Done<br>Variable names mentioned in the abstract (according to reviewer comment) |
| Captions should briefly explain the tables should be understandable without reference to the text. It is not appropriate about table 2.<br>Also the abbreviations should be explained in the footnote of the table. | Done |
| The study was only on adolescent boys. Also, because high-risk behaviors vary in different societies, write "Iranian male Adolescents." | Done |
| You have discussed each motivation of high-risk behavior except “calculation”. | Done<br>Discussion on calculation was also added |
| Please use abbreviated name of the journals according to MEDLINE database. You also may find abbreviations on the Wikipedia website. | Done<br>According to MEDLINE |
| | |
| | |

**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.

**Mehran Zarghami**: EIC | **Revision (1)** 16 Apr 2021

Dear Authors,
Thank you for your recent revisions.
Your paper has now been evaluated again by the Editorial Team. Unfortunately you have not done all of the requested revisions, nor have you responded to all of the reviewers' comments. Please do your revisions according to the mentioned appended 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.

**Dear Reviewers**

**Thanks for the valuable comments**

**The requested comments were applied to the article.**

| Reviewer comments | Authors responses |
|---|---|
| Please correct.<br>(Only terms appearing frequently (three or more times) within the abstract may be abbreviated, but should be spelled out at first citation) | Done |
| Various researchers have studied this before, including Mokhtarnia et al. (21), Mohammadi et al. (22), Tao et al. (23), Thornberry et al. (24), Draucker and Mazurczyk (25), and Johnson et al. (26). Please explain about the novelty of your study.<br>(Please write the explanation you mentioned in response to the reviewers here.) | Done<br>The requested explanations was added to the text. |
| Please correct. | Done |
| Please explain about the implementation steps of the study. Where did the subjects fill out the questionnaires? Were they paper based or electronic? If it was electronics, in what space was it sent and collected? If they were paper based, who distributed the questionnaires? How were the questionnaires collected? | Done and highlighted in the text |
| Captions should briefly explain the tables should be understandable without reference to the text. It is not appropriate about table 1.<br>. | Done<br>similar to articles published in previous issues of the journal |
| Captions should briefly explain the tables should be understandable without reference to the text. It is not appropriate about table 2. | Done<br>Table 2 was deleted. Instead, similar to articles published in previous issues of the journal, model fit indices were provided in the text.<br><br>Abbreviations are spelled out under the heading 2.3 in the text. |
| Please correct the abbreviations. Abbreviated name of the journals should be according to MEDLINE database. For example the abbreviated name of the | Done<br>All abbreviations were checked again |

| | |
|---|---|
| "*Journal of Adolescence*" is "J Adolesc.". | |

**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**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 15 May 2021

Dear EIC,
Thank you very much for revising the manuscript, I think the necessary revisions have been done and the manuscript can be published in IJPBS.
Thanks.

**Mehran Zarghami**: EIC | **Revision** (2) 15 May 2021

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