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

IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/ijpbs.110135
Published in: IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 16(1); e110135

Peer Review Report for "Effectiveness of Acceptance and Commitment Therapy in Depression and Anxiety in People with Substance Use Disorder"

Author(s): Zohreh Hashemi, Sanaz Eyni, Matineh Ebadi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	13 Oct 2020
Revised Date:	26 Sep 2021
Accepted Date:	20 Dec 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) — 25 Oct 2020

Dear AE,

The article is well-written. Only the sample size is not explained. The content of the intervention sessions is long written, which should be summarized.
There is no problem in writing.

Kind Regards,

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 27 Nov 2020

Dear AE

Thanks for the opportunity to review the manuscript entitled "The Effectiveness of Acceptance and Commitment Therapy on Depression and Anxiety in People with Substance Abuse Disorder: A Case Study of West Azerbaijan Province". The paper presents a clinical trial about the effectiveness of ACT on comorbid anxiety/depression

symptoms of substance use-disordered individuals. It appears that that manuscript tried to investigate new therapy effectiveness on an important target group with multiple psychological problems in Iran. The emphasis on comorbid symptoms and the therapy's effectiveness is a valuable idea. However, there are several significant concerns that I empathically recommend authors to carefully consider and revise their manuscript in order to improve its quality.

Major concerns:

1. The phraseology and word selection of the manuscript should be improved. There are many words and phrases that were not correctly used in the manuscript.
For example, we don't use the word tool in English for scales and measures. It's better to change it to instrument, or entry and exit must be changed to inclusion and exclusion criteria. Instead of optionality, it's better to use it voluntarily.
There are many such mistakes in all parts of the manuscript (e. g. psychotic situation, experimental experiment, entry and exit criteria, optionality, cycle education) that some of them come from way of building and organizing sentences in English based on direct translation of Farsi words and sentences, and make difficult following and understanding ideas manuscript explain.
2. charactistic and demographics of sample should be included in a table.
3. the results aren't reported in an appropriate way. For what and how the results should be reported, authors are recommended to use the latest version of the APA manual. Tables and text explanations of results should be written in a standard format. Tables related to presumptions of analysis would be eliminated and only pointed out in the text.
4. ACT effectiveness mechanism on depression and anxiety aren't discussed according to previous works and papers. Authors need to cite references when explaining how psychological flexibility impacted depression and anxiety (again, authors could use the review or meta-analysis articles).
5. the literature on ACT effectiveness on substance disorders isn't considered, and ACT effectiveness on psychological disorders literature is comprehensive. Authors need to use meta-analysis articles published in the ACT field
example articles for literature review:
1. A-Tjak J, G, L, Davis M, L, Morina N, Powers M, B, Smits J, A, J, Emmelkamp P, M, G. (2015). A Meta-Analysis of the Efficacy of Acceptance and Commitment Therapy for Clinically Relevant Mental and Physical Health Problems. Psychother Psychosom, 84:30-36.
2. Gloster, A T. Walder, N., Levin, M. E., Twohig, M. P. Karekla, M. (2020). The empirical status of acceptance and commitment therapy: A review of meta-analyses, Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science, 18, 81-192.

Minor concerns:

1. Apparently, the title implies a case study design, but the manuscript's methodology is experimental, which confuses the reader about the nature of the research. The authors need to clarify or modify their methodology and manuscript title.
2. Since in the DSM-5, the two related categories (abuse and dependent) are integrated into one diagnosis (substance use disorder), the authors need to revise and use the appropriate

terminologies of this domain.
3. There is no need to translate the names of places or special names into English (e.g., way of hope, art of living, etc.).

Kind Regards

¬ **REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision (0)** 14 Jul 2021

Dear AE,

There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
Correct the title of the article.
The Effectiveness of Acceptance and Commitment Therapy on Depression and Anxiety in People with Substance Abuse Disorder
Correct the abstract of the article in terms of writing and content. Correct the statistical population. 1398? Hess? Questionnaire name (BDI-II) is incorrect. Sort the keywords alphabetically.
The introduction is incoherent and should be corrected using new sources. Words such as addiction, dependence, and the like are not used due to changes in the DSM-5. Try to use more appropriate words, such as substance abuse disorder. The research background has not been carefully reviewed. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4525449/ The importance of doing this research is unclear.
Correct the method section. The sampling method is not explained in detail. Why did the sample size increase to 30 people? The method of reporting the questionnaires is inappropriate.
Are there differences between groups in demographic variables? Modify the title and method of writing the table. Check the data in Table 5.
Correct the discussion section. First, point out the important findings of this article. Then the similarities and differences between the findings of this article and other findings of other articles should be noted. Use other sources, especially newer sources, to explain the results. Finally, discuss the limitations and suggestions.

Kind Regards

¬ **Abolfazl Mohammadi**: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 27 Aug 2021

Dear EIC,

There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:

The manuscript entitled "The Effectiveness of Acceptance and Commitment Therapy on Depression and Anxiety in People with Substance Abuse Disorder: A Case Study of West Azerbaijan Province," which you submitted to the IJPBS, has been reviewed. You can find the comments of reviewers as follows. Please revise your manuscript based on those comments and submit a revised version to IJPBS.
Major concerns:
1. The phraseology and word selection of the manuscript should be improved. There are

many words and phrases not correctly used in the manuscript.
For example, we don't use the word tool in English for scales and measures. It's better to change it to instrument, or entry and exit must be changed into inclusion and exclusion criteria. Instead of optionality, it's better to use it voluntarily.
There are many such mistakes in all parts of the manuscript (e. g. psychotic situation, experimental experiment, entry and exit criteria, optionality, cycle education) some of them come from the way of building and organizing sentences in English based on direct translation of Farsi words and sentences and make difficult following and understanding ideas manuscript explain.
2. chrematistics and demographics of the sample should be included in a table.
3. the results aren't reported in an appropriate way. For what and how results should be reported, authors are recommended to use the latest version of the APA manual. Tables and text explaining the result should be written in a standard format. Tables related to presumptions of analysis would be eliminated and only pointed out in the text.
4. Mechanisms on the change of ACT on depression and anxiety aren't discussed according to previous works and papers. Authors need to cite references when explaining how psychological flexibility impacted depression and anxiety (again, authors could use the review or meta-analysis articles).
5. The literature on ACT effectiveness on substance disorders isn't considered, and ACT effectiveness on psychological disorders literature is comprehensive. Authors need to use meta-analysis articles published in the ACT field
example articles for literature review:
1. A-Tjak J, G, L, Davis M, L, Morina N, Powers M, B, Smits J, A, J, Emmelkamp P, M, G. (2015). A Meta-Analysis of the Efficacy of Acceptance and Commitment Therapy for Clinically Relevant Mental and Physical Health Problems. Psychother Psychosom, 84:30-36.
2. Gloster, A T. Walder, N., Levin, M. E., Twohig, M. P. Karekla, M. (2020). The empirical status of acceptance and commitment therapy: A review of meta-analyses, Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science, 18, 81-192.
6. Also, please revise the method section. The sampling method is not explained in detail. Why did the sample size increase to 30 people? The method of reporting the questionnaires is inappropriate.
7. And, finally revise the discussion section. First, point out the important findings of this article. Then, the similarities and differences between the findings of this article and other research findings should be noted. Use other sources, especially newer sources, to explain the results. Finally, discuss the limitations and suggestions.

Minor concerns:
1. Apparently, the title implies a case study design, but the manuscript's methodology is experimental, which confuses the reader about the nature of the research. Authors need to clarify or modify their methodology and manuscript title.
2. Since in the DSM-5, the two related categories (abuse and dependent) are integrated with one diagnosis (substance use disorder), the authors need to revise and use the appropriate terminologies of this domain.
3. There is no need to translate the names of places or special names into English (e.g., way of hope, art of living, etc.).

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to the IJPBS. I look forward to your revision.

Kind Regards,
AE

¬ **Mehran Zarghami**: EIC | **Revision (**0**)** 2 Sep 2021

Dear Authors,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript for consideration for publication in the Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences. External peer reviewers have evaluated your paper. Please revise it according to their comments. I would appreciate it if you could do the revisions as soon as possible.

After revision, authors are obliged to upload reviewers' comments in a Word file in which they reply to each comment individually. Please note that the full manuscript file must be highlighted to indicate revised texts.

Besides, please pay attention to the word count limitation:
Word count limits are declared in this link: https://brieflands.com/journals/ij-psychiatry-and-behavioral-sciences/knowledgebase/category/tree#word_count_limits

We look forward to receiving your revised manuscript. Thank you for sending your work to the Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences.

Kind Regards,
EIC

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.

first referee	Comment	How to modify
	Sample size is not explained	In the method section, the sample size was modified and .explained
	The content of the intervention sessions is long written, which should be summarized	The content of the intervention .sessions was summarized

second referee	Phraseology and word choice in the article should be improved. Many words and phrases .are not used correctly in the article For example, we do not use the word tool in English for scale and measurement. It is better to change it to an instrument; Or entry and exit should change to entry and exit criteria. Instead of being optional, it is better to use it .voluntarily	These cases were to be reviewed and corrected in the article. I do not know if it is done or not
	Specifications and demographics of the sample should be included in a table	Profile and demographic table added
	Results are not reported properly. Authors are advised to use the latest version of the APA Guide to determine the outcome and how to report. Tables and text descriptions of the result should be written in standard format. Tables related to analytics assumptions are removed and referenced only in the text	All tables of results were revised .and modified The text of the description was .modified in the standard format The table related to the analysis assumptions was removed and included in the text
	Based on previous works and articles, the mechanism of effectiveness of ACT on depression and anxiety has not been discussed. Authors should cite sources when explaining how psychological resilience affects depression and anxiety (authors can again use review or .meta-analysis articles)	In the discussion section, the effectiveness mechanism of commitment-based therapy and acceptance on depression and anxiety was added and discussed based on review articles. Prohibitions added
	The literature on the effectiveness of ACT on substance abuse is not considered and the effect of ACT on mental disorders is comprehensive. Authors should use published meta-analysis articles on ACT	Research and cases related to the effectiveness of commitment-based and acceptance therapy on substance abuse disorder were added
	The title seems to imply a case study design, but	The title of the article was modified based on the

	the method of the article is experimental and confuses the reader about the nature of the research. Authors should clarify or modify the .method and title of their article	experimental article method
	Because the DSM-5 combines the two categories (abuse and dependency) into one diagnosis (substance abuse disorder), authors should revise and use appropriate terms in this .area	Was corrected
	There is no need to translate the names of places or specific names into English (for example, the way of hope, the art of living, etc	Was corrected

Third referee	Correct the title of the article	Was corrected
	Correct the article in terms of writing and content. Reform of the statistical community in 1398? Hiss? Questionnaire name (BDI-II) is incorrect. Arrange the keywords in alphabetical order	Article abstract was corrected in .terms of writing and content The statistical population was .modified The name of the questionnaire was modified Keywords were sorted by letters
	Introduction is inconsistent and should be .corrected using new sources	Introduction was corrected using the article suggested by the honorable referee and other new .and related sources
	Modify the method section. The sampling method is not explained in detail. Why did the sample size increase to 30 people? The .questionnaire reporting method is inappropriate	The method section was .modified Necessary explanations were .provided regarding sampling .Sampling size was explained The method of reporting the questionnaires was completely .changed
	Are there differences between groups in demographic variables? Change the title and method of writing the table. Check the data in .Table 5	The samples were as homogeneous as possible and the groups did not differ significantly in terms of .demographic variables The title and method of writing .the tables changed The data in Table 5 were .reviewed
	Modify the discussion section. First, list the - important findings of this article. Then the similarities and differences between the findings of this article and other findings of other articles should be mentioned. Use other sources,	The discussion section was reviewed and amended according to the opinion of the .honorable referee Newer sources added

	especially newer sources, to explain the results. .Finally, discuss the limitations and suggestions	Restrictions and suggestions .were revised and amended

Editor's Comments		Tables were set according to the journal format

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 16 Dec 2021

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.
AE

Mehran Zarghami: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 20 Dec 2021

Dear Author,
We have completed our review of your manuscript and are pleased to inform you that it is being 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, and we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.
Kind Regards,
EIC