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://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijpbs.109103
Published in: Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 15(4); e109103

Peer Review Report for "Predicting Addiction Susceptibility Based on Big Five Personality Traits"

Author(s): Reza Zeighami, Seyede Marzieh Hosseini, Navid Mohammadi, Saeed Shahsavari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 5 Sep 2020
Revised Date: 16 Feb 2021
Accepted Date: 7 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.

pezhman hadinezhad: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 5 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1- Please let me know how could you discriminate between the experience of substance use and addiction?
For example, there are a lot of experiences of substance use in novelty seekers but it does not mean addiction.
2- I wonder how you deal with confounding factors such as emotion dysregulation or other major psychiatric problems.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 21 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
The current manuscript has no novelty.
The sample size calculation is very vague. I mean it is not clear why this number has been selected.
The manuscript is full of serious grammatical and typo problems.

The discussion is not well-developed.
At least 50% of references should be studies published in English from Iran. There are too many international references.
Inclusion and exclusion criteria are not clear.
Kind regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision (0)** 13 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
It is a simple paper with no serious statistical analyses.
The study has no novelty. it does not help answer a problem in society.
The discussion is short and not scientific.
The paper is full of serious grammatical and typo problems.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 17 Nov 2020

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

Mehran Zarghami: EIC | **Revision (0)** 21 Nov 2020

Dear Authors,
Your paper has been evaluated by external peer reviewers. Please do your revisions according to the reviewers' 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.
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 editor:

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. All of comments done in manuscript. Only one comment about discussion remained that one reviewer said it is short and other said it must be decreased to 450 words.

According to comments:

Sample size explained more.

50% references belonged to Iranian study.

Inclusion & exclusion criteria added.

First paragraph of introduction changed according to comments.

Table redesigned according the last issue of journal and embedded in result section.

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) 7 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) 10 Feb 2021

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

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. All of comments done in manuscript. According to comments:

1. Title changed.
2. References revised based on comments: use abbreviation names and DOI. Availability and writing style of them revised and 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.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 19 Feb 2021

Dear EIC,
Thanks for sending the requested revisions to our journal.
It is acceptable on my side for publishing.
Thank you

Mehran Zarghami: EIC | **Revision** (2) 7 Mar 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.
Regards