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.108789
Published in: Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 15(2); e108789

Peer Review Report for "The Comparative Study of Pretend Plays Between 5 - 7 Years Old High-functioning Autistic Children and Their Normal Peers with Child-initiated Pretend Play Assessment"

Author(s): Navid Mirzakhany, Mansure Farzinfar, Minoo Dabiri Golchin

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 31 Aug 2020
Revised Date: 23 Feb 2021
Accepted Date: 13 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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 13 Dec 2020

Dear EIC,
This is with further reference to this paper submitted for possible publication in IJPBS.
The paper has been carefully reviewed and it is suggested that the manuscript requires considerable revision and should be modified according to the reviewers' comments which are appended below.
Thanks

Mehran Zarghami: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 13 Dec 2020

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
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.

IJPBS

(Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences)

	Manuscript Code: 108789			Answer
	Manuscript Title: The Comparative Study of Pretend Plays between 5-7 Years Old High Functioning Autistic Children and Their Normal Peers with "Child Initiated Pretend Play Assessment			
1.	Is the title descriptive of the contents? Comments:	Yes☑	No☐	
2.	Is the abstract descriptive of the contents? Comments: **Conclusion of the article is not entirely based on the results. As you have mentioned in the background of the article, citing the reference No.3: "Disabilities in play skills, especially deficiencies in pretend play, are among the characteristics of autistic children. Pretend play an essential role in a child's growth and development", and "Play education can reduce the visible differences between children with autism and typical children. This reduction in apparent differences will increase the chances of autistic and Asperger's children participating in social or even educational skills". Therefore, without this study, we can have the mentioned conclusion by referring to previous studies.**	Yes☐	No☑	I changed the abstract
3.	Are the Keywords appropriate? Keywords should be matched with MeSH. Please use **keywords which exist in MeSH. You can use the following address: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/**	Yes☐	No☑	I removed non-Mesh terms
4.	Does the background summarize relevant literature in the field? Comments:	Yes☑	No☐	
5.	Does the objectives clearly presented?	Yes☑	No☐	
6.	Are the study design, techniques and	Yes☐	No☑	I added its

	equipments clearly described? Are they appropriate? Comments: **Everything is mentioned in the study method section, except "Pretend Plays". Also please add the "Ethical Committee" approval code. Besides, "high-functioning autistic children" needs an operational definition.**			definition
7.	Are the statistical methods used appropriate to the study? Do they fully support the conclusion drawn? Comments:	Yes☑	No☐	
8.	Are the results clearly and concisely presented and relevant to the manuscript? Comments: **In the middle of the findings is written: "C:\Users\Dabiri\Downloads\Table 3. Distribution of mean and standard deviation statistics and the significance level of scores of ChIPPA test variables in autistic children and typical peers using independent t-test". Maybe something went wrong, which needs to be corrected. Besides, it is necessary to compare the demographic characteristics of the two groups.**	Yes☐	No☑	I corrected that
9.	Is the discussion relevant to the conclusion? Comments: **Almost all the findings were found in previous studies. In other words, this study did not have any new findings to discuss. However, as you have mentioned in the first paragraph of the discussion, in NIA (number of imitated actions) scores the mean of autistic children was higher than their peers.". This finding was not unexpected for autistic children too. However, based on this and other findings, it is expected that suggestions will be made to correct this**	Yes☐	No☑	It was an English error to use "despite" I changed that. Also added a part in introduction

	situation. **The "discussion" of the article is irrelevant to the "results".**			
10.	Would material in the text be better presented as a table? Comments:	Yes☐	No☑	
11.	Are tables well organized and easy to follow? Comments:	Yes☑	No☐	
12.	Is the material presented in tables consistent with that presented in the text? Comments:	Yes☑	No☐	
13.	Is the illustrative material essential for clarification of the text? Comments: **There was no illustrative material.**	Yes☐	No☐	
14.	Are the references up-to-date and adequately cover the topics? Comments: **Please revise the references according to the guidelines of the journal. Please use abbreviated name of the journals according to MEDLINE database. You also may find abbreviations on the Wikipedia website. You should also mention the city where the books are published. Besides, most of the references are old.**	Yes☐	No☑	I changed the style by kowsar style
15.	Is the paper well written (in terms of the English)? Comments: **The English of the paper needs improvement in grammar and structure, some polishment and careful proofreading before publication. Possibly, a native-speaker review would help on this.**	Yes☐	No☑	I corrected some errors
16.	Does the paper significantly advance knowledge in the field? Comments: **Not significantly.**	Yes☐	No☑	
17.	Your general recommendation: Accept as it is ☐ Accept after minor revision ☑ Accept after major ☐			

revision Accept as short communication reject	☐		

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) 9 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
There is some suggestion regarding minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the authors to respond to the reviewers' comments and revise their manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 9 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,
Thanks for the authors' recent revisions.
This paper has now been evaluated again by the Editorial Team and external peer reviewers. Unfortunately, the authors have not done all of the requested revisions, nor have they responded to all of the reviewers' comments. They should do their revisions according to the mentioned comments. I appreciate them doing the revisions as soon as possible by using the track changes mode in MS Word and using colored text.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 9 Jan 2021

Dear Author,
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 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 Reviewer1:

I have changed all the asked areas mentioned by you. I changed the abstract conclusion to make it more specific to our study. All the keywords were Mesh but “chippa”. I removed that from the keywords. The definition of pretend play and the ethical approval code added. High functioning ASD is now defined in the text. I corrected the table outline. Some English errors are corrected now. I also updated the reference list. I deeply appreciate your time and attention to our work, your valuable comments certainly improved our work. I would be grateful to change any other suggestion you may make. Thank you so much.

Sincerely

Corresponding Author

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)** 22 Jan 2021

Dear Author,
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. Indeed, you only paid attention to comment number 6. Please see the attachment and make the requested corrections.
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 (3)

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** (3) 18 Feb 2021

Dear EIC,
Thanks for the recent revisions.
This paper has now been evaluated again. According to the reviewer's comments it needs some more revisions.
Thanks.

Mehran Zarghami: EIC | **Revision** (3) 18 Feb 2021

Dear Author,
Thank you for your recent revisions.
Your paper has now been evaluated again by the Editorial Team and external peer reviewers. 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 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 (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 Reviewer

Thanks for your valuable opinions and suggestions. I corrected all the asked points. But:

+ In my reference list it was a symposium that you mentioned to be corrected. You have written that I have to mention the exact date, unfortunately I did not find any exact date, however I wrote the pages where the paper is published. I checked other references who have cited this reference. It was this:

“Cong Chen, Ajay Chander, Kanji Uchino, and Kimiko Ryokai. 2016. Guided Play: Automatic Stereotypical Behavior Analysis and Intervention during Play. In Proceedings of the 2016 Annual Symposium on Computer-Human Interaction in Play Companion Extended Abstracts (CHI PLAY Companion '16).ACM, New York, NY, USA, 109-115. DOI:https://doiorg.ezproxy.tlu.ee/10.1145/2968120.2987727”

But since it was not the asked style of reporting, I used what you have sent me.

+ You asked that why the environment of getting the test is different for typically developed children and (in kindergarten) and children with autism (in clinic). Because ChIPPA is a standard tool with a pack of playing tools and the only demanded thing for that, is to find a room empty from other toys, a neutral environment for child. Therefore it is not important where we do the examination, it just should not be in the middle of familiar toys for the child. I hope the added descriptions in the paper would solve this question as well.

Thank you again for your time and attention

Sincerely

Corresponding Author

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)** 13 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.