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.108610
Published in: Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 15(2); e108610

Peer Review Report for "The Effect of Training Health Care Providers Using Gamification Method on Social Skills of Preschool Children"

Author(s): Sajjad Ranjbar Kouchaksaraei, Zahra Keshtkaran, Zahra Karimian

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 17 Aug 2020
Revised Date: 4 Mar 2021
Accepted Date: 14 Mar 2021

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 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for this nice article. I read and enjoyed the article.
In my opinion, the article needs minor revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 30 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
The important thing about this article is the logic of the action taken. You have done something useful for the age group of children (gamification method), for an adults population (healthcare providers). Also, the contradiction that can be seen in the article is that you have written that you have trained health care providers and this training has increased their knowledge. But in the title and discussion section of the article, you wrote that you taught the children. And most importantly, you have written that educating children has increased the knowledge of health care providers! I guess you meant it wrong.
See my other points of view in the margins of the attached text.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 30 Oct 2020

Dear EIC,
This paper has been evaluated by external peer reviewers. The authors should do their revisions according to the reviewers' comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 30 Oct 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.

Hello

Dear Referees;

Many thanks to the respectable referees, the revised is sent based on referees' comments. Also, the topic is changed according to raised misunderstanding.

Many thanks

Q: The title of the article is not expressive. According to this title, the researchers have done the intervention to one group (education to the children) and evaluated its impact on another group (health care providers). According to the content of the article, the following title seems better: "Effect of gamification-based preschool children's social skills teaching to the healthcare providers on their knowledge of this subject" or ""Effect of social skills gamification-based teaching of healthcare providers of preschool children".

R: The title was changed considering the risen misunderstanding.

Q: Delete this sentence. This is the objective.

R: The change has been applied according to the comments of the referee.

Q: Do you want to educate children and evaluate its impact on health care providers?

R: The study was done on health care providers, therefore, the existing ambiguity in this section was corrected according to the comment.

Q: For the original research, traditional sections are required including:

- Background
- Objectives (optional)
- Methods
- Results
- Discussion
- Conclusion
- References
- Acknowledgments

R: It was corrected accordingly.

Q: Mention the type of test.

R: Statistical tests have been mentioned.

Q: For the original research, traditional sections are required including:

- Background

- Objectives (optional)
- Methods
- Results
- Discussion
- Conclusion
- References
- Acknowledgments

R: It was corrected accordingly.

Q: Do you mean a significant increase in the knowledge of health care providers after educational intervention?

R: Yes. It has been mentioned in the text.

Q: Do you mean a significant increase in the knowledge of health care providers in all components of the questionnaire after educational intervention?

R: Yes. In all the educational parameters that have been mentioned in the sentence.

Q: Is this significant relationship (relationship between the level of education of health care providers and their knowledge) related to before the intervention or after the intervention or both?

R: There was a significant relationship between the level of university education and knowledge scores in the three time periods.

Q: This sentence is a repetition of the findings.

R: It has been corrected.

Q: These two sentences are not related to the subject of this research and cannot be concluded from the findings of the present study.

R: This problem and the ambiguity were also corrected according to the comment.

Q: Keywords should be MESH-based and written in alphabetical order.

R: It has been corrected.

Q: This sentence is vague and needs clarification.

R: The ambiguity has been resolved.

Q: Why did you write about nurses? Were all health care providers nurses?

R: The incorrect statement has been removed.

Q: Do you want to educate children and evaluate its impact on health care providers?

R: The ambiguity was removed. The purpose is educating health care providers which has been corrected in the sentence.

Q: For the original research, traditional sections are required including:

- Background
- Objectives (optional)
- Methods
- Results
- Discussion
- Conclusion
- References
- Acknowledgments

R: It was corrected accordingly.

Q: The study population?

R: It was corrected accordingly.

Q: Mention the operational definition of health care providers. Besides, mention the name of the place of the study (you have mentioned “Shiraz” in the abstract).

R: It has been corrected.

Q: Please mention the inclusion and exclusion criteria.

R: The pointed points have been added.

Q: Please mention the sampling method.

R: It has been done.

Q: Please mention the experts’ characteristics.

R: It has been mentioned and done.

Q: Do you mean “personal information”?

R: Yes. The change has been applied.

Q: What do you mean by "educational consequences"?

R: The required change has been applied and complementary explanations have been provided.

Q: For the original research, traditional sections are required including:

- Background
- Objectives (optional)
- Methods
- Results
- Discussion
- Conclusion
- References
- Acknowledgments

R: It was corrected accordingly.

Q: I do not understand you. What is the importance of having a significant relationship between the knowledge of the study group in three time periods?

R: This is the result of the job which has been mentioned and the next sentence is actually our emphasis which is the first sentence in parallel with that and is not in contradiction.

Q: What matters is this part of the sentence. Your emphasis should be on increasing the knowledge of the intervention group.

R: Yes. It is true and the previous sentence has been a prolong to it and they are not in contradiction.

Q: Do you mean “level of education”? What was the education range of the study group?

R: Range of education is mentioned and corrected in the right place and a change has been mentioned in this part to resolve ambiguity.

Q: You should mention operational definition of “type of employment”.

R: It was corrected accordingly.

Q: Do you mean “level of education”?

R: It was corrected.

Q: You should mention operational definition of “discipline”.

R: It was corrected.

Q: Do you mean “duration of job experience”?

R: It was corrected.

Q: Didn't you teach health care providers?

R: It was corrected.

Q: What is the importance of having a significant relationship between the knowledge of the study group in three time periods?

R: The importance of this issue is mentioned and correction has been applied.

Q: They have taught children and measured it’s impact on children's skills. While you have trained health care providers and examined the impact of training on their knowledge.

R: Correction has been done. Of course, it needs to be mentioned that no study close to this one has been found which has been mentioned.

Q: They have examine the effect of a playful activity program on the development of social skills in preschool aged children. While you have trained health care providers and examined the impact of training on their knowledge.

R: Correction has been done and new related resources have been replaced.

Q: What is the similarity between your study and this study? They have intervened on children, but you have intervened (an intervention that is appropriate for children) on health care providers.

R: Correction has been done and new related resources have been replaced.

Q: What is the importance of having a significant relationship between the knowledge of the study group in three time periods?

R: Its importance has been mentioned and corrections has been done.

Q: 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).

Also, in non-English references (including Persian references), indicate the language of the reference in parentheses at the end of the reference.

R: Correction has been done.

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) 5 Feb 2021

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** (1) 5 Feb 2021

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

Hello

Dear Referees;

Many thanks to the respectable referees, the revised is sent based on referees' comments. Also, the topic is changed according to raised misunderstanding.

Many thanks

Q: Given the above comments, if my inference is correct, the title of the article needs to be corrected. For example: "Assessing the knowledge of health care providers about social skills of preschool children after education by gamification method" or "The effect of education to health care providers on social skills of preschool children with gamification method" It should be noted that since your study is not a descriptive study, it is not necessary that the place of study be written in the title of the article. So you can delete the "Iranian" word.

R: The title was changed considering the risen misunderstanding and The change has been applied according to the comments of the referee.

Q: Given the above comments, if my inference is correct, theobjective of the article needs to be corrected. For example: "This study aimed to see the effect of education to health care providers on social skills of preschool children with gamification method. " Or "This study aimed to assess the knowledge of health care providers about social skills of preschool children after education by gamification method"

R: The change has been applied according to the comments of the referee.

Q: Use the past tense.

R: It has been corrected.

Q: It is better to write: "Shiraz-Iran".

R: It has been corrected.

Q: Obviously, those who meet the inclusion criteria enter the study. So either write the inclusion criteria, or delete these few words.

R: It has been corrected.

Q: Write "an educational software".

R: It has been corrected.

Q: Delete these words.

R: It has been corrected.

Q: Add: “at three times of before, immediately after, and one month” here.

R: The change has been applied according to the comments of the referee.

Q: It is better to correct this sentence as follows: "Increasing the awareness of health care providers through gamification method showed that this method has an important role in implementing social skills training for children.”

R: The change has been applied according to the comments of the referee.

Q: Recommendation and conclusion are two separate categories. According to the present study, such a conclusion can not be concluded. In other words, generalizations to teachers and parents should be made with caution. Therefore, it is recommended to remove this sentence from the “conclusion”.

R: Yes. That’s right. It has been corrected.

Q: 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/

R: It has been corrected

Q: It is recommended to modify this sentence as follows:

“Unfortunately, no studies have been found in the literature on the knowledge of health care providers, and ways to increase this knowledge in relation to children's social skills.”

R: The change has been applied according to the comments of the referee.

Q: Write the object with a separate subtitle. Given the above comments, if my inference is correct, the objective of the article needs to be corrected. For example: “This study aimed to see the effect of education to health care providers on social skills of preschool children with gamification method. “ Or “This study aimed to assess the knowledge of health care providers about social skills of preschool children after education by gamification method”

R: The change has been applied according to the comments of the referee.

Q: It is better to write: “Shiraz-Iran”.

R: It has been corrected.

Q: Explain the demographic variables briefly.

R: It has been corrected.

Q: Briefly describe the content and components of the questionnaire, the scope, and the types of skills it measures.

R: It has been corrected.

Q: Use past tense.

R: The change was made.

Q: Correct the name of the university as: “Shiraz University of Medical Sciences”.

R: The change was made.

Q: I do not understand you. What is the importance of having a significant relationship between the knowledge of the study group in three time periods?

R: R: This problem and the ambiguity were corrected

Q: What matters is this part of the sentence. Your emphasis should be on increasing the knowledge of the intervention group.

R: corrected according to the comment.

Q: It is better to use the term "level of education".

R: It has been corrected.

Q: It is better to use the term "Level of education".

R: It has been corrected.

Q: What do you mean by "Major"?

R: (Field of Study). It has been corrected.

Q: It is necessary to briefly explain about " Type of employment " in the "Methods" section where you describe the demographic characteristics. In other words, write the operational definition of " Type of employment ".

R: The change has been applied according to the comments of the referee.

Q: Modify as follows:“Duration of job experience”

R: The change has been applied according to the comments of the referee.

Q: It is better to use the term "Level of education".

R: The change has been applied according to the comments of the referee.

Q: What do you mean by "Discipline"?

R: It has been corrected.

Q: Modify as follows: “Duration of job experience”.

R: The change has been applied according to the comments of the referee.

Q: It is better to use the term "Level of education".

R: The change has been applied according to the comments of the referee.

Q: What do you mean by "Discipline"?

R: It has been corrected.

Q: Modify as follows: “Duration of job experience”.

R: The change has been applied according to the comments of the referee.

Q: In the discussion section, it is necessary to refer to other studies that have been done in the field of gamification method of training. Even if this training method has been used in other fields.

R: The change has been applied according to the comments of the referee.

Q: What is the importance of having a significant relationship between the knowledge of the study group in three time periods? Your emphasis should be on increasing the knowledge of the intervention group. It is better to write the following paragraph instead of this paragraph: “This study was conducted to assess the knowledge of health care providers about social skills of preschool children after education by gamification method. Results of the study showed significant increases in mean post-intervention scores. There was also a significant relationship between the mean total score of health care providers' knowledge about children's social skills before, immediately and one month after the intervention with the training provided to them. In such a way that the average total score of individuals has increased after the intervention, which is a sign of the positive effect of gamification on the knowledge of health care providers. No study similar to the present study was found in the literature review. However, the findings of some studies are comparable to our study; Such as studies that have examined the impact of social skills training programs. In one study, the level of knowledge of classroom teachers about children's social skills was measured after social skills training. 17 teachers were in the control group and 12 teachers were in the experimental group. The final results showed that the 4-session training program is effective on teachers and its effects are sustainable (30). As well, other researchers reported that an educational program increased teachers' knowledge regarding social needs of students with ADHD (31).”

R: R: The change has been applied according to the comments of the referee.

Q: It is better to write the following paragraph instead of this paragraph: “Another study was conducted to investigate the relationship between teachers' level of knowledge in teaching social skills and social skills of the students. The results indicated a moderate level of relationship between teachers' level of knowledge in teaching social skills and social skills of students with special needs, while a high level relationship was found between teachers' level of knowledge in social skills training and social skills of regular students (32). No educational intervention was performed in that study.”

R: The change has been applied according to the comments of the referee.

Q: It is better to write the following paragraph instead of this paragraph:“Another study was conducted to investigate the relationship between teachers' level of knowledge in teaching social skills and social skills of the students. The results indicated a moderate level of relationship between teachers' level of knowledge in teaching social skills and social skills of students with special needs, while a high level relationship was found between teachers' level of knowledge in social skills training and social skills of regular students (32). No educational intervention was performed in that study.”

R: The change has been applied according to the comments of the referee.

Q: It is better to write the following paragraph instead of this paragraph: "Another finding of our study was the relationship between participants' level of education and their knowledge scores on children's social skills. So that the average knowledge score of people with a master's degree was significantly higher than others, which showed the effect of academic degree as a variable on the level of health care providers' knowledge. But the results of this part of the present study were not parallel to the findings of Yildiz et al.; In such a way that the academic degrees of teachers in their study was not an effective variable on the level of knowledge of teachers (32).

R: The change has been applied according to the comments of the referee.

Q: It is better to correct this sentence as follows: "Increasing the awareness of health care providers through gamification method showed that this method has an important role in implementing social skills training for children. The significance of the results of this study is that health care providers act like teachers in the health system. Informing health care providers and increasing their knowledge will lead them to better understanding of children, properly assessment of their social skills, and better education to children, parents, and teachers."

R: The change has been applied according to the comments of the referee.

Q: Was the training of this course only virtual?

R: The ambiguity was removed. And the wrong words were removed.

Q: Was the training of this course only virtual?

R: It has been corrected.

Q: 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).

Also the DOI of some references are not written.

R: It has been corrected.

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)** 14 Mar 2021

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.