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.105564
Published in: Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 14(4); e105564

Peer Review Report for "Predictive Factors for the Sense of Community Belonging Among Older Adults in Lower Northern Thailand"

Author(s): Nithra Kitreerawutiwong, Orawan Keeratisiroj, Sunsanee Mekrungrongwong

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 23 May 2020
Revised Date: 5 Sep 2020
Accepted Date: 18 Sep 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) — 14 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1. It doesn't describe the relevant dates, including periods of data collection.
2. It doesn't clearly define all potential confounders and effect modifiers.
3. It doesn't describe efforts to address all potential sources of bias.
4. It doesn't present the source of funding and the role of funders for the present study (if exists).
5. Lack of informed consent.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 28 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
This article is well written and deals with an important topic that is in the scope of journal. However, it needs some minor revisions. Please mention time of the study, as well as ethical considerations. Besides, reference writing should be modified. The titles of journals should be abbreviated according to the style used in Index Medicus. Consult the List of Journals Indexed in Index Medicus, published annually as a separate publication by the

library and as a list in the January issue of Index Medicus. The list can also be obtained through the library's web site (http://www.nlm.nih.gov).
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 28 Aug 2020

Dear EIC,
The paper has been evaluated by external peer reviewers. Please do your revisions according to the reviewers' comments. I appreciate doing the revisions as soon as possible by using the track changes mode in MS Word and using colored text.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 28 Aug 2020

Dear Author,
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 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.

Authors' response to editor and reviewer

Manuscript ID: 105564

Title: Predictive Factors for the Sense of Community Belonging among Older Adults in Lower Northern Thailand

Authors:

Nithra Kitreerawutiwong[1*], BNS, MPH, PhD, email: nithrakm@gmail.com; nithrak@nu.ac.th

Orawan Keeratisiroj[2], PT, MPH (Biostatistics), PhD (Clinical Epidemiology), email: orawansa.nu@gmail.com

Sunsanee Mekrungrengwong[3], BSc (Chemistry), BPH, MSc (Public Health), PhD (Medical Science), email: sunsanee.mnui@gmail.com

[1-3]Assistant Professor, Faculty of Public Health, Naresuan University

*** Corresponding author:** Nithra Kitreerawutiwong, Faculty of Public Health, Naresuan University, Phitsanulok, 65000, Thailand

E-mail: nithrakm@gmail.com, nithrak@nu.ac.th

Revision Version: 1 **Date:** 2 August 2020

Dear Editor,

We are sending you the revised manuscript entitled: “Predictive Factors for the Sense of Community Belonging among Older Adults in Lower Northern Thailand”, (Manuscript ID: 105564) to be considered for publication in Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences.

There is no financial or other conflict of interest and all authors have seen and approved the manuscript.

Our responses to the suggestions of the reviewer and editor are attached, together with explanation of the revisions made.

On behalf of all co-authors,

Nithra Kitreerawutiwong, BNS, MPH, PhD (Corresponding Author)

Faculty of Public Health, Naresuan University

Muang District, Phitsanulok Province

Postal Code: 65000

Tel: 66 89 7048920

e-mail: nithrakm@gmail.com; nithrak@nu.ac.th

Replies to Editor's queries

Minor Revisions

The revision was reply to all reviewers' comments as one by one. A highlighted manuscript was done in red text in word file.

Reviewer 1:

1.It doesn't describe the relevant dates, including periods of data collection.

Response: The relevant dates, including periods of data collection was describe in method section as below.

Page 3 of 14

3. Methods

This study had a cross-sectional design. Data was collected during October 2017 to September 2018.

2.It doesn't clearly define all potential confounders and effect modifiers.

Response: From checking with univariate analysis and interaction effect testing, it was found that all potential confounders and effect modifiers did not show significance in this study. However, in this study, we adjusted for all significant variables in Table 3. The revision was performed in the manuscript as below.

Page 8-9 of 14

Predictive factors for SOB to the community

The univariate analyses showed that only three factors, including social support, neighborhood environment, and duration of living in the community ($P<0.001$), were significantly related to SOB. The final model, based on the forward stepwise multiple regression analysis, showed that social support, neighborhood environment, duration of living in the community, and education higher than grade 4 were positively correlated with SOB.

Also, the number of family members, always-sufficient income, and occasionally sufficient income were negatively correlated with SOB to the community. Univariate analysis and interaction effect were tested and found that all potential confounders and effect modifiers did not show significance. All significant variables were adjusted in Table 3.

3.It doesn't describe efforts to address all potential sources of bias.

Response: The potential sources of bias was added in the manuscript. The revision was illustrated as below.

Page 4 of 14

"…… Finally, to obtain the proportion of older adults, cluster sampling was carried out in each district, followed by simple random sampling to determine the number of Sub-District Health Promoting Hospitals (SDHPH). In each SDHPH, the subjects were selected from the family folder system to minimize selection bias.

The inclusion criteria were as follows: 1) age above 60 years; 2) living in the area for more than six months; 3) being able to communicate; and 4) voluntary participation in the study. Older adults, who were diagnosed with psychological disorders were excluded from the study due to their reduced threat perception. Five public health professionals were trained as research assistants to minimize information bias.

4.It doesn't present the source of funding and the role of funders for the present study (if exists).

Response: The funding was support by the academic services according to one of the missions of the university. The university has four missions including teaching, research, academic services, and art and culture conservation. The university had a partnership with the office of Provincial Cluster: Lower Northern Provincial Cluster 1 therefore, this office

supports the funding to work collaboratively on strategic plan. This result of this study was present to the funding source used as the base line information to design the specific program enabling the livings of the senior citizen. For the previous information that identify no funding due to misunderstanding of research funding on research activity.

Page 12 of 14

Funding

This study was supported by Provincial Cluster: Lower Northern Provincial Cluster 1 on academic services.

5.Lack of informed consent.

Response: The information regarding the informed consent was present in page 5 of 16 as below.

Page 4-5 of 14

The Institutional Review Board of Naresuan University approved this study ethically (COA No.: 034/2018). The researchers provided information and allowed for voluntary participation.

Reviewer 2:

This article is well written and deals with an important topic that is in the scope of journal. However, it needs some minor revisions. Please mention time of the study, as well as ethical considerations. Besides, reference writing should be modified. The titles of journals should be abbreviated according to the style used in Index Medicus. Consult the List of Journals Indexed in Index Medicus, published annually as a separate publication by the library and as a list in the January issue of Index Medicus. The list can also be obtained through the library's web site (http://www.nlm.nih.gov).

1. Please mention time of the study, as well as ethical considerations.

Response: Time of the study and ethical considerations were improved as present in the revision manuscript.

Page 3 of 14 (Time of the study)

4. Methods

This study had a cross-sectional design. Data was collected during October 2017 to September 2018.

Page 4-5 of 14 (Ethical consideration)

The Institutional Review Board of Naresuan University approved this study ethically (COA No.: 034/2018). The researchers provided information and allowed for voluntary participation.

2. Besides, reference writing should be modified. The titles of journals should be abbreviated according to the style used in Index Medicus. Consult the List of Journals Indexed in Index Medicus, published annually as a separate publication by the library and as

a list in the January issue of Index Medicus. The list can also be obtained through the library's web site (http://www.nlm.nih.gov).

Response:

Page 12 -14

All the title of the journals was revised in the abbreviation format according to the suggestion.

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) 18 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
The article entitled "Predictive Factors for the Sense of Community Belonging among Older Adults in Lower Northern
Thailand" is an interesting and informative one, as it deals with the factors affecting the mental health of senior citizens and the
importance of providing a safe and supportive environment for them.
The study is well-designed and the article is well written. However, I noticed a couple of mistakes that I have indicated in the article.
In my opinion, the article is appropriate for publication in the Journal.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 18 Sep 2020

Dear EIC,
It is a pleasure to accept the manuscript for publication in Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences (IJPBS).
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 18 Sep 2020

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.