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.106514
Published in: Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 14(4); e106514

Peer Review Report for "The Prevalence and Outcome of Disruptive Behaviors in Nurses and Physicians: A Descriptive Study in Iranian Health Care Context"

Author(s): Mahmoud Saghaei, Gholamhossein Ahmadzadeh, Somayeh Haghighat

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 16 Jun 2020
Revised Date: 20 Aug 2020
Accepted Date: 21 Nov 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) — 23 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
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, they should pay extra charge for publishing.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 29 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1- The title has a new idea.
2- The manuscript needs completed editing by a native editor (researcher-made questionnaire? ward of activity? the questionnaire was retested for inter-rater with 30 respondents? Following was a definition of disruptive behavior to prepare the participant to

answer 120 questions? and controlling it is of great value?)
3- “the participants” is unclear and should be described exactly.
4- “The abusers” is ambiguous and should be described exactly.
5- Explain how the study size was arrived at.
6- Describe the comparability of the groups.
7- Describe all statistical methods
8- The authors write: “The aim of the study was explained to the participants before interventions”, what are the interventions?
9- The authors write” The second part contains questions on the frequency of physician, nurse and other personnel’s disruptive behavior (6 items), its effects on patient care and safety, clinical and psychological outcomes (8 items), and the rules related to disruptive behavior and the status of the handling the disruptive behaviors in the center (6 items)”, please mention these subscales measures in the groups study.
10- The references should be updating.
Thanks.

Hamideh Azimi Lolaty: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 29 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
Because of the convenience sampling, the results not be generalize it was the research limitation.
The research made questionnaire did not explain efficiency by the exact psychometric properties tests,
Please explain the data get from the research- made questionnaire by a table of the questions insisted of text.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 13 Jul 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) 17 Jul 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.

Greetings, courtesy and respect for your service, experts and professors of Iranian journal of psychiatry and behavioral sciences

Special thanks also to the esteemed referees who enriched this manuscript with their valuable suggestions. Respectfully, the amendments were made in accordance with the comments of respected reviewers and were specified in the revised word file with the track change mode. In addition, in the present file (reply to reviewers), the answer to each of the comments of the esteemed reviewers is provided.

Thanks a lot

N	reviewer's question	author's reply
Reviewer 1		
1	*Because of the convenience sampling,the results not be generalize it was the research limitation.*	This was added to the research limitations.
2	*The research made questionnaire did not explain efficiency by the exact psychometric properties tests ,*	Respectfully, the explanation was corrected in its place.
3	*Please explain the data get from the research- made questionnaire by a table of the questions insisted of text.*	According to the comment of the honorable referee, the relevant results were set in the table of questions. Also, in order to reduce the word count in the article, the number of article figures was reduced to three.
Reviewer 2		
1	*The title has a new idea.*	-
2	*The manuscript needs completed editing by a native editor (researcher-made questionnaire? ward of activity? the questionnaire was retested for inter-rater with 30 respondents? Following was a definition of disruptive behavior to prepare the participant to answer 120 questions? and controlling it is of great value?)*	In terms of language, the manuscript was reviewed by an expert and the necessary corrections were made.
3	*"the participants" is unclear and should be described exactly.*	Study participants were explained more clearly.
4	*"The abusers" is ambiguous and should be described exactly.*	Respectfully, the word "the abusers" is not used in the manuscript and the author did not understand the exact meaning of the honorable referee.
5	*Explain how the study size was arrived at.*	Respectfully, the relevant explanation was added in the text.
6	*Describe the comparability of the groups.*	Based on what the author found out from the content of the esteemed referee's comment, there was no grouping in the present study. The main respondents to the questionnaire in this study were physicians and nurses and then other personnel working in

		medical centers.
7	*Describe all statistical methods*	Respectfully, information related to the present study was reported in the form of absolute and relative frequency distributions and no specific statistical test was used.
8	*The authors write: "The aim of the study was explained to the participants before interventions", what are the interventions?*	Respectfully, there was no intervention and the relevant word was deleted.
9	*The authors write" The second part contains questions on the frequency of physician, nurse and other personnel's disruptive behavior (6 items), its effects on patient care and safety, clinical and psychological outcomes (8 items), and the rules related to disruptive behavior and the status of the handling the disruptive behaviors in the center (6 items)", please mention these subscales measures in the groups study.*	Respectfully, the requested explanation was provided in the relevant place.
10	*The references should be updating.*	According to the comment of the esteemed referee, the references were updated and changes were made in some parts of the background and discussion according to the new references.
Reviewer 3		
1	*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 for publishing.*	According to the comment of the esteemed referee, the number of words was limited and the text was edited accordingly. The number of references, figures and tables were in accordance with the referee's comments.

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) 14 Sep 2020

Dear EIC,
Thanks for revising the manuscript according to reviewers` comments.
Thanks.

Mehran Zarghami: EIC | **Revision** (1) 21 Nov 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.