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

KOWSAR
Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijpbs.108390
Published in: Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: In Press(In Press); e108390

Peer Review Report for "A Comparison of Methylphenidate (MPH) and Combined Methylphenidate with *Crocus sativus* (Saffron) in the Treatment of Children and Adolescents with ADHD: A Randomized, Double-Blind, Parallel-Group, Clinical Trial"

Author(s): Mojtaba Khaksarian, Nazanin Ahangari, Abbas Masjedi-Arani, Iman Mirr, Hassan Jafari, Saeed Kordian, Roghieh Nooripour, Saba Hasanvandi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	19 Aug 2020
Revised Date:	24 Apr 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.

Masoud Behzadifar: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 15 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
The manuscript is well writing. The authors should revise the references according to the format of the journal.
Thanks.

Hasan Abolghasem Gorji: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 16 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
- In the introductory section, introduce the hypothesis of the effect of saffron on reducing

ADHD symptoms with newer psychiatric evidence.
- In the method section, explain more clearly the division of the sample into two groups.
- Wouldn't it be more appropriate to use other psychiatric tools such as the CBCL or the Coners-3 scale? Please state your reason.
- Explain your work in the novelty discussion section.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (**0**)** 27 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,
The article has a good text and its English is well edited. In general, based on the reviewers' comments, it only needs small changes.
Thanks.

Mehran Zarghami: EIC | **Revision (**0**)** 10 Feb 2021

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.

Dear reviewers

All requests were modified in the text of the article.

1. *In the introductory section, the hypothesis of the effect of saffron on reducing ADHD symptoms with newer psychiatric evidence is stated.*
2. *In the method section, the division of the sample into two groups explain more clearly.*
3. *More appropriate tools were used because other psychiatric tools such as the CBCL or the Coners-3 scale could not be answered by parents and teachers.*
4. *In the discussion section, the results were explained based on novel research.*

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)** 18 Feb 2021

Dear Authors,
Thank you for your recent revisions.
Your paper has now been evaluated again. It needs some more revisions. Please do your revisions according to these 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 (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

All requests were modified in the text of the article.

1. *In the introductory section, the hypothesis of the effect of saffron on reducing ADHD symptoms with newer psychiatric evidence is stated.*
2. *In the method section, the division of the sample into two groups explain more clearly.*
3. *More appropriate tools were used because other psychiatric tools such as the CBCL or the Coners-3 scale could not be answered by parents and teachers.*
4. *In the discussion section, the results were explained based on novel research.*

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.

Mehran Zarghami: EIC | **Revision (2)** 28 Feb 2021

Dear Authors,

Thank you for your recent revisions.

Your paper has now been evaluated again. According to the appended comments, it needs some more revisions. Please do your revisions according to these 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 (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.

Dear reviewers

All requests were modified in the text of the article.

Reply to reviewer 1

1. *All references were adapted based on format of the journal both inside and at the end of the text*.

Reply to reviewer 2

1. *In the introductory section, the hypothesis of the effect of saffron on reducing ADHD symptoms with newer psychiatric evidence is stated.*
2. *In the method section, the division of the sample into two groups explain more clearly.*
3. *More appropriate tools were not used because other psychiatric tools such as the CBCL or the Coners-3 scale could not be answered by parents and teachers.*
4. *In the discussion section, the results were explained based on novel research.*

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.

Mehran Zarghami: EIC | **Revision** (3) 26 Mar 2021

Dear Authors,
Unfortunately, none of the requested corrections have been made. The required corrections will be provided in the attachment (108390-EIC Comments).
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.

Dear reviewers

All requests were modified in the text of the article.

Reply to reviewer 1

1. *All references were adapted based on format of the journal both inside and at the end of the text*.

Reply to reviewer 2

1. *In the introductory section, the hypothesis of the effect of saffron on reducing ADHD symptoms with newer psychiatric evidence is stated.*
2. *In the method section, the division of the sample into two groups explain more clearly.*
3. *More appropriate tools were not used because other psychiatric tools such as the CBCL or the Coners-3 scale could not be answered by parents and teachers.*
4. *In the discussion section, the results were explained based on novel research.*

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.

Mehran Zarghami: EIC | **Revision** (4) 8 Apr 2021

Dear authors,
Unfortunately, none of the requested corrections have been made.
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.

Dear reviewers

All requests were modified in the text of the article.

Reply to reviewer 1

1. *All references were adapted based on format of the journal both inside and at the end of the text*.

Reply to reviewer 2

1. *In the introductory section, the hypothesis of the effect of saffron on reducing ADHD symptoms with newer psychiatric evidence is stated.*
2. *In the method section, the division of the sample into two groups explain more clearly.*
3. *More appropriate tools were not used because other psychiatric tools such as the CBCL or the Coners-3 scale could not be answered by parents and teachers.*
4. *In the discussion section, the results were explained based on novel research.*

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) 20 Apr 2021

Dear Authors,

Thank you for your recent revisions.

Your paper has now been evaluated again. 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 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 (6)

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 EIC

All requests were modified in the text and references of the article.

1. *In introduction, the highlighted sentence was cited.*
2. *In description of participants, past tense was used.*
3. *In discussion, dopamine (line 245) was stated with lowercase letter.*
4. *In discussion, in line 249, "improving" was used instead of "increasing".*
5. *In discussion, line 255, "some studies" were used instead of "a study".*
6. *In discussion, in line 265, recommended sentence was use instead of the prior sentence.*
7. *In discussion, in line 273, quote was deleted.*
8. *In discussion, in line 276, the incomprehensible sentence was corrected.*
9. *In references, all journal name abbreviations based on "Index Medicus" style were used.*
10. *In references, At the end of the references that are books in addition to the name of the publisher, the city of the place of publication was added.*
11. *In references, the DOI of all the articles at the end of them was added.*

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (6)

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** (6) 15 May 2021

Dear EIC,
Thanks 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** (6) 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.