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.110618
Published in: IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 16(2); e110618

Peer Review Report for "Effects of Cognitive Dissonance Activation Emerged from Not Imposing Lockdown Restrictions on COVID-19-related Attitudes and Preventive Actions Considering the Role of Gender"

Author(s): Shabnam Javanmard

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	26 Oct 2020
Revised Date:	2 Jan 2022
Accepted Date:	28 Jan 2022

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) 4 Dec 2021

Dear AE,

I totally enjoyed reading this work. There were many positive aspects to this work, such as the importance and necessity of the research topic, well-written manuscript, thorough and meticulous report of the findings, and applying the proper statistical analysis. However, I would like to mention a few things here:

1- In the demographic characteristics of the sample, you mentioned “underlying medical condition” and “family members’ underlying condition,” which were significant variables in the preventive behaviors of people during a pandemic, but you didn’t use the findings in the analysis or further expand the idea in the discussion.

2- Also, in the demographic characteristics table, you mentioned “Media,” which appears for the first time, but you did not mention why you evaluated it or what the significance of this variable is.

3- There’s a significant difference between education level groups, which might have had a mediating role like gender in the study, which I think calls for further investigation and

explanation.

Kind Regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 13 Dec 2021

NoneDear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to the comments this manuscript needs minor revision.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 16 Dec 2021

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to the comments this manuscript needs minor revision.
Thanks

Mehran Zarghami: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 16 Dec 2021

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

Mehran Zarghami: EIC | **Revision** (0) 16 Dec 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.

Dear reviewers,

Thank you for your valuable and precise points that made a great contribution to improving my paper. Here are the explanations of the revisions which were made in the paper based on your points.

Reviewer 1:

1- **Q:** *A structured abstract is required including these headings:*

- *Background*
- *Objectives*
- *Methods*
- *Results*
- *Conclusions*

R: The abstract structure was revised (page 1-line 3)

2- **Q:** *A list of three to five keywords should be included below the abstract in alphabetical order, and 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/ If suitable MESH terms are not yet available for recently introduced terms, present terms may be used.*

R: Keywords were checked in MESH list and were removed and modified based on the recommended terms. Also, the keywords were presented in alphabetical order (page 1, last line)

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

- Background
- Objectives
- Methods
- Results
- Discussion
- Conclusion
- References
- Acknowledgments

R: Objectives section was included (page 7, line 16)

4- **Q:** *Please explain sample size calculation, as well as sampling metod.*

R: Sampling method and calculation was explained (page 8, line 12)

5- **Q***: Use the word "home keeper" when it comes to jobs.*

R: it was corrected (page 8, line 24)

6- All the DOIs, city of publications and abbreviated names in the references were added and revised. They are highlighted in the manuscript.

Reviewer 2:

1- Q: should this be hyphenated?
R: The dash was removed (page 1, first line of title)

2- Q: Capitalize

R: "The" was capitalized (page 1, line 6 of abstract)

3- Q: point out that these two are questionnaires

R: It was mentioned that these are questionnaires (page 1, line 6 of abstract)

4- Q: *In demographic characteristics of the sample you mentioned "underlying medical condition" and "family members' underlying condition", which were significant variables in the preventive behaviors of people during pandemic, but you didn't use the findings in the analysis or further expand the idea in discussion.*

R: None of the "underlying medical condition" and "family members' underlying condition" were significant for further discussion or explanation. As the "F" value (table 2) is not significant, they are not significant determinants of health-related action and justification. So, they were just reported as demographic variables (page 9, first line).

5- Q*: Also in demographic characteristics table you mentioned "Media", which appears in the table for the first time, and you did not mention why you evaluated it on what is the significance of this variable?*

R: The information about media was added to this section. Since Media was assessed as a background variable and a descriptive information, it was not expanded in findings and discussion sections. (page 9, line 2)
Also, the "F" value (table 2) is not significant, so it is not significant determinants of health-related action and justification. So, this is just reported as demographic variables.

6- *Q: I recommend using quotations for group names to avoid confusion*

R: Quotations were added (page 11, line 15)

7- *Q: leads*

R: s was added (page 17, first line)

8- *Q: There's a significant difference between education level groups, that might have had a mediating role like gender in the study, which I think calls for further investigation and explanation.*

R: As education level was a background variable and was not significant in "action" variable, it was not expanded in discussion section and it was suggested for further examination in future research. (page 18, line 8)

Reviewer 3:

1- *Q: The introduction is very long*

R: Some sentences were removed in order to shorten introduction. However, as the article needs a theorical background, eliminating more words will come at the cost of perfect understanding of the main problem (page 3, line 2).

2- *Q: Indicate which regions of Iran the samples were from*

R: The regions that sample was from were mentioned (page 8, line 17).

3- Q: *No reference was made to the validity and reliability of the tools used and it was not specified where it was standardized.*

R: As it is mentioned in the "material" section, both questionnaires were developed for this study. So, the evidence of validity and reliability of the instruments examined in this research and was reported in the "finding" section (Table 1, page 22).

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) 20 Jan 2022

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) 28 Jan 2022

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