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.108468
Published in: Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 15(1); e108468

Peer Review Report for "Stress System and Social Interaction Focusing on the Sexual Pathway"

Author(s): Fahimeh Ghahvehchi-Hosseini, Hedayat Sahraei, Boshra Hatef

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 19 Aug 2020
Revised Date: 11 Oct 2020
Accepted Date: 13 Dec 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) — 20 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
The authors can check the uploaded file.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 9 Oct 2020

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 9 Oct 2020

Dear Authors,
Thank you for your recent revisions.
Your paper has now been evaluated again. According to the reviewer's 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.

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

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.

Response to reviewer

Dear Reviewer and Dr Zarghami

I tried to modify the context with notice to reviewer comments to decrease the directed or bias look. This paper proposed new insight to social problem, communication of two genders, based on brain function. If there is a mention to Islamic teaching because we believe that we need to research link between nature and Islamic rules.

The more activation of emotional centers of men than women was been proven during sexual stimulation not only in rest or under stress that mentioned in the paper.

The paper does not focus on the body coverage in the workplace but discusses the neuroscience aspect of sexual privacy to maintain the mental and general health.

The English writing be revised and the text was improved.

I wish our manuscript is suitable to publish in your valid journal.

Thank you for kind attention

Boshra Hatef

Dear Dr Zarghami,

Thank you very much for sharing the “letter to the editor” submitted to your Journal with the title:

“Stress System and social interaction focusing on the Sexual Pathway”.

The letter is presenting a biological model trying to justify that women should be covered in the workplace because men’s neurobiological systems are more sensitive to sexual stimulations. It conveys also some other implicit psycho-social hypotheses such as the rigidity of a society’s behavior to change and takes it for granted implicitly that the people across the society, in this case an entire country, are culturally homogenous. In case there was such homogeneity, there would be no need for such a paper!

The author is referring to a series of papers as evidence. The evidence review has not been neutral. For example, in some instances the author refers to research showing higher levels of hyperactivity in male amygdala, while the reference is indicating hyperactivity in the *resting condition* or under *stress* and not during sexual arousal.

In another occasion, the author refers to pheromones. The magnitude of the impact of the pheromones on human beings remains controversial and even where there has been such a claim; it has been mentioned that they are excreted much more commonly by men and not women. And the fact that they are possibly affecting the women during ovulation in their menstrual cycle ! this controversial evidence even if proved, should ask men to cover their body not to emit such fragrance! Another function of pheromones has been claimed to enhance disassortative mating to prevent genetic anomalies and the latter theory even if supported, questions its role as a general sexual stimulator.

The author has also stepped into a sophisticated area, trying to bring about scientific reasoning to prove religious regulations. This is a method which has been criticized equally both by many religious leaders and philosophers and those scientists who believe science is an ever changing area of human

endeavor. However, this should not prevent the paper from publication as this is author's personal point of view. Letters to editors naturally reflect personal viewpoints and this letter is not an exception.

Suggestions

Since the author seems to have dedicated much time to prepare the letter, it can be accepted to be published, provided that it goes through linguistic editing by the editorial. The author should also be advised to summarize it further and mention the non-systematic evidence review and the limitations of the theory.

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) — 14 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 21 Nov 2020

Dear EIC,
Thanks to the authors for revising the manuscript, I think the necessary revisions have been done and the manuscript can be published in IJPBS.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 13 Dec 2020

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.