IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Volume 15 · Issue 2 · e106634

OPEN PEER REVIEW

There Is No Fool Like an Old Fool: The Experiences of Elderlies Regarding Remarriage in Iran

Parvaneh Asgari, Elham Navab, Maryam Esmaeili, Mahboobeh Shali, Yee Bit-Lian, Fatemeh Bahramnezhad

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
20 Jun 2020	15 Dec 2020	30 Jan 2021	10.5812/ijpbs.106634

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Referee 2, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 8
3 **Revision 2** Editor-in-Chief 9
Authors' reply to reviewers 10
Reviewer and editor comments 11

1 Original submission

3 comments · 19 Aug 2020 – 8 Sep 2020

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 19 Aug 2020

Greetings,
State the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the sample.
Why were in-depth interviews conducted and no focus group formed?
Present the demographic characteristics of the sample in a table or chart.
Elaborate on the discussion using more up-to-date references.
In the conclusion, explain what this study contributes to society.
References
Add up-to-date English or Persian articles from 2019 to 2020.
State the ethics code along with the name of the university.
Provide the DOIs for the articles.
Thank you

Referee 2 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 23 Aug 2020

This is a well-written manuscript that addresses an understudied problem (remarriage of the elderly) in our country, which does not have a strong research presence in this area. This makes me very enthusiastic about the work.

Methods are clear. Please provide more detailed statistical information about the themes and subthemes expressed in table 2.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 8 Sep 2020

Your paper has been evaluated by external peer reviewers. Please revise your paper according to the reviewers' comments. I would appreciate it if you made the revisions as soon as possible using Track Changes in MS Word and colored text.

After revision, authors are obliged to upload a Word file containing the reviewers' comments and their responses 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.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear Editor

We thank both reviewers for their constructive and thoughtful comments. We corrected all of the comments. But some of them, like Nano silver particle, is not in Mesh. Also, some of the references don't have DOI. All corrections are highlighted in the text and explained in the cover letter.

Regards

Comments	Correction	
Reviewer 1	*Methods are clear. Please provide more detailed statistical information about the themes and sub themes expressed in table 2*	According to this approach, after each interview, it was listened for several times and then was transcribed. First of all, the text was read for several times and the sentences and meaningful units describing the experienceon of interest were extracted. This led to the extraction of 150 phrases, sentences, and paragraphs from interviews, that according to the commonalities, were organized based on the categories and subcategories and, finally, with careful study of interviews and thinking about inherent categories of the experienceon, four main categories and 14 subcategories emerged.
	according to guideline of IJPBS,Keywords 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/" and they should be ordered according to alphabet. *Some keywords are not selected from MESH*	I checked the mesh again but it only had the word elderly and the word marriage. Other words are not in the mesh. Elderly,
The manuscript has poor English style and must be completely edited again.	We checked all of the text again	

Fore example: elderly is an adjective but in this sentence "Elderly is considered as a natural process and one of the stages of 7 people's life and in this regard". Elderly was written without any noun		
In abstract: "Granheim and Lundman was used for coding and categorizing the data" is wrong. In fact, Granheim and Lundman ` method was used.	This is approach not method for coding . I send a reference for this issue Graneheim UH, Lundman B. Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. Nurse education today. 2004 Feb 1;24(2):105-12.	
When you assessed the experience of elderly people, the phenomenological approach is the best way to get data. In this article , the type of study is a qualitative study with phenomenological approach but data analyzed with content analysis. Please correct the title and the method section.	We corrected it.	
In method section: please explain more about interviewer ,who interviewed with the elderly and where? *How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone?* *How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?* *Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace* *Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?*	In order to have participants with rich experiences, parks, mosques, and cultural centers in Tehran were chosen. Purposive sampling method was used and the population consisted of all old people who experienced remarriage and their spouses were alive. Within a period of seven months, 30 interviews(face to face) were conducted with 20 old people by author corresponding . The interviews continued until no new categories emerged. Some participants were conservative at the	

	beginning of the interview and answered the questions very vaguely, but as the interview continued and they trusted the researcher, they were fully involved in the continuation of the interview. None of the participants we offered an interview with refused to be interviewed.	
Reviewer 3	*The inclusion and exclusion criteria of the samples should be mentioned.*	Inclusion criteria include willingness to participate in study, remarriage, and non-divorce or death of a second spouse.
What is the reason that in-depth interviews were conducted and a focus group was not formed?	Through the interviews, we actually gained depth of people's experience None of the participants were willing to participate in the focus group	
The demographic characteristics of the sample should be presented in a table or chart.	We explain in Table 1. It is loaded in a separate file called table. Table1: Demographic characteristics of elderly people participating in the study	
The discussion should be explained with more up-to-date sources.	All sources are between 2010 and 2019, and we really did not find a new source Unfortunately, this doubles the importance of the fact that few studies have been conducted on the remarriage of the elderly	
The conclusion section should explain what the achievement of this study is for society.	Because with the psychological and physical support of the elderly, with remarriage, the elderly are referred to a nursing home. This helps to provide psychological support to families and makes the society more dynamic. The emotional burden of being in a nursing home is much less. Respect for the elderly	

	is maintained.	
The ethics code should be mentioned together with the name of the university.	Ethics Committee of Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran(IR.TUMS.FNM.REC.1397.050),	
The DOIs of the articles should be mentioned.	Any reference that had a DOI. This was added and highlighted	

[Translated from Persian by the Brieflands editorial office.]

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 8 Nov 2020

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 8 Nov 2020

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 make your revisions according to these comments. I would appreciate it if you could make the revisions using the track changes mode in MS Word and colored text.

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Respected Editor-in-Chief of the journal Iran J Psychiatry Behav Sci

With greetings and respect

With thanks for the reviewers' comments

Our article is a conventional content analysis and assessed individuals' experiences of their remarriage, and, as we also explained in the text, we used the conventional content analysis approach and did not use the phenomenological approach. It is true that we assessed individuals' experiences, but this was not with a phenomenological approach.

Regarding MeSH, we checked with MeSH both this time and the previous time; elderly is in MeSH; nevertheless, we replaced it with Aged. Qualitative research, content analysis are in MeSH. The word Iran is not in MeSH; well, it is a country. The word remarriage is not in MeSH and there is no equivalent word in MeSH either; we consulted with each other and removed the word Remarriage and put the word marriage in its place. Although we know that it does not convey the meaning of remarriage, we made this change out of respect for the respected reviewer. Respectfully, Bahramnejad

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 30 Jan 2021

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 30 Jan 2021

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 in the editorial process.
Thank you for your fine contribution. On behalf of the Editors of IJPBS, we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.