IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Volume 15 · Issue 3 · e113096

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Effectiveness of Internet-based Cognitive Behavioral Therapy in Weight Loss, Stress, Anxiety, and Depression via Virtual Group Therapy

Najme Abedishargh, Abbas Ramezani Farani, Banafsheh Gharraee, Hojjatollah Farahani

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
19 Jan 2021	29 May 2021	22 Jun 2021	10.5812/ijpbs.113096

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 7
3 **Revision 2** Editor-in-Chief 8
Authors' reply to reviewers 9
Reviewer and editor comments 12

1 Original submission

1 comment · 5 Mar 2021

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 5 Mar 2021

Your paper has been evaluated by external peer reviewers. Please revise your paper according to the reviewers' comments. I would appreciate it if you could make the revisions as soon as possible using Track Changes mode in MS Word and colored text.

After revision, authors are obliged to upload a Word file containing the reviewers' comments and their responses to all comments, one by one.

Besides, please pay attention to the word count limitation:
Word count limits are specified at 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.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

response to reviewers comments

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript. We also greatly appreciate the reviewers for their complimentary comments and suggestions. We have carried out the experiments that the reviewers suggested and revised the manuscript accordingly Please find attached a point-by-point response to reviewer's concerns. We hope that you find our responses satisfactory and that the manuscript is now acceptable for publication. Sincerely,

Reviewer 1:

1-The meaning is not clear, please revise. We agree with the reviewer and have revised it.

2-summarise the following items: study phase, sample size, randomization, blinding if done and single or multi center We agree with the reviewer and have revised it.
3-This sentence needs to be edited. We agree with the reviewer and have revised it.
4-Please provide further evidence of inconsistencies in the effectiveness of your intervention.

If there is evidence of the effectiveness of your intervention, what is the need for your study? We agree with the reviewer and have revised it.

5-Mention if the study has a clinical trial code. We agree with the reviewer and have revised it.

6- -Define the Setting of study.

-provide a clear description of randomization and blinding if don-Specify how to Assignment? We agree with the reviewer and have revised it.

7-BMI≥ 25? We agree with the reviewer and have revised it.

8- First, mention the study outcome variables. We agree with the reviewer and have revised it.

9-The analysis is not clearly stated; it needs more details that should be mentioned in the text or in the table.

It is mentioned that the mean of BMI has decreased, Compared to which values?? We agree with the reviewer and have revised it.

10- Table 4 is not clear.

Mean and standard deviation of outcome variables, before and after the intervention should be mentioned for all three groups with P-values. We agree with the reviewer and have revised it.and added Table 2 and added additional descriptions

.

:Reviewer 2

.Greetings, and thank you for your efforts

.In the abstract, the introduction is not understandable

.The keywords should be based on MeSH. Response: Done

In the introduction

An accurate and scientific definition of CBT should be provided, and internet-based CBT should be defined and its differences stated. In addition, the results of existing studies on the variables .examined in the present study should be mentioned. Response: Done

In the introduction, nothing should be mentioned about COVID-19 and its role in overweight. What is the reason for mentioning COVID-19, when it is not named in the text and results of the abstract or in .the main aim of the study? Response: COVID-19 was removed from the title and introduction

In the methods section

The sample size formula should be stated. Response: I completed the information in this section and spoke with a statistical consultant about it, and they said that when we use G Power the formula is not .stated, and only the numbers entered into G Power should be stated

The content of the training package should be summarised. The material should be presented .descriptively, and it should be stated from what source this package was derived. Response: Done

The BMI questionnaire in the methods needs rewriting; the questionnaire, its scoring method, and its .foreign and Iranian validity and reliability should be explained

.The effect size should be stated. Response: It was rewritten

.At the end of the discussion, the conclusion should come in a few separate lines. Response: Done

The number of references is large; in total, 35 to 40 references are enough, provided they are from reputable journals, and book sources and internet sources should be removed. Response: Done. One .or two book titles and internet sources that played an important role in the article were retained

.The RCT code should be stated. Response: Done

.The text needs literary editing. Response: Done

Thank you

:Reviewer 3

Keywords: according to guideline of IJPBS,Keywords should be taken from those recommended by -1 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

Internet-based cognitive-behavioral therapy "was not chosen from MESH. Response: I reviesed it"

2- "iCBT" should be replaced by "ICBT" in the whole article. We agree with the reviewer and have revised it.3- Introduction is very long, cut in half. Response: *The introduction was shortened but parts were added according to the opinion of other reviewers.*

4- In method: explain more about online meetings. Was it held every day? How long was each session? Were participants able to chat in this group during the day or did they interact only within the time frame of each session? We agree with the reviewer and have revised it.

5- In method, Explain about the type of randomization. We agree with the reviewer and have revised it.

6- Please remove table 2 and briefly explain its content in the text. Response: We agree with the reviewer and have revised it.*deleted Table 2 and its description according to the consultant's opinion*

7- References:Please use abbreviated name of the journals according to MEDLINE database. You also may find abbreviations on the Wikipedia website.

For non-English references, translate the title to English, enclose the translation in square brackets,

and add an abbreviated language designator.
Write its DOI at the end of each reference. We agree with the reviewer and have revised it.

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 4 May 2021 – 25 May 2021

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 4 May 2021

Dear Author,
Unfortunately, the response-to-reviewers file was not sufficient. You answered most of the questions with " I agree with reviewers and revised it", but some parts of the article that you changed or revised are not highlighted. Please respond to each reviewer's comment and highlight the revised sentences in the text.
In addition, in the method section, it was written, "The present study was a randomized controlled trial (IRCT20210306050594N1)", and elsewhere it was written, “ This study is a semi-experimental research with a pretest-posttest”. This is a paradox!

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 25 May 2021

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 make your revisions according to these comments. I would appreciate it if you could make the revisions as soon as possible using Track Changes mode in MS Word and colored text.

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

response to reviewers comments

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript. We also greatly appreciate the reviewers for their complimentary comments and suggestions. We have carried out the experiments that the reviewers suggested and revised the manuscript accordingly Please find attached a point-by-point response to reviewer's concerns. We hope that you find our responses satisfactory and that the manuscript is now acceptable for publication. Sincerely,

Reviewer 1:

1-The meaning is not clear, please revise. The word was changed

2-summarise the following items: study phase, sample size, randomization, blinding if done and single or multi center This sentence was changed and highlighted in the text
3-This sentence needs to be edited. The sentence was edited.
4-Please provide further evidence of inconsistencies in the effectiveness of your intervention.

If there is evidence of the effectiveness of your intervention, what is the need for your study? Inconsistent results mentioned in the justification study

5-Mention if the study has a clinical trial code. ok

6- -Define the Setting of study.

-provide a clear description of randomization and blinding if don-Specify how to Assignment? Your comments have been applied

7-BMI≥ 25? ok

8- First, mention the study outcome variables. This sentence was changed and highlighted in the text

9-The analysis is not clearly stated; it needs more details that should be mentioned in the text or in the table.

It is mentioned that the mean of BMI has decreased, Compared to which values?? The sentences were changed and Table 2 was also given for additional explanation

10- Table 4 is not clear.

Mean and standard deviation of outcome variables, before and after the intervention should be mentioned for all three groups with P-values. we accepted and added Table 2 and added additional descriptions

.

:Reviewer 2

.Greetings, and thank you for your efforts

With greetings and respect, thank you for your careful review. The points you mentioned were applied; in cases where change was not possible, we gave explanations, but if there is another .solution for the problem you mentioned, the authors are ready to accept it

.In the abstract, the introduction is not understandable. Response: The sentences were changed

.The keywords should be based on MeSH. Response: Done

In the introduction

An accurate and scientific definition of CBT should be provided, and internet-based CBT should be defined and its differences stated. In addition, the results of existing studies on the variables examined in the present study should be mentioned. Response: The definition of CBT and internet-based CBT and its difference were stated. The studies related to weight loss had already been .mentioned and were highlighted, and studies on anxiety, stress and anxiety were added

In the introduction, nothing should be mentioned about COVID-19 and its role in overweight. What is the reason for mentioning COVID-19, when it is not named in the text and results of the abstract or in the main aim of the study? Response: Based on the consultants' opinion, the word COVID-19 was .removed from the title and introduction

In the methods section

The sample size formula should be stated. Response: I completed the information in this section and spoke with a statistical consultant about it, and they said that when we use G Power the formula is not stated, and only the numbers entered into G Power should be stated; but if, given these explanations, the sample size formula is needed, [please let us know] so that we do it, or if there is another solution, .please tell us

The content of the training package should be summarised. The material should be presented descriptively, and it should be stated from what source this package was derived. Response: The .training package was summarised and stated in the text, and the source was stated

The BMI questionnaire in the methods needs rewriting; the questionnaire, its scoring method, and its foreign and Iranian validity and reliability should be explained. The effect size should be stated. Response: Body mass index was rewritten, and the calculation method according to the World Health Organization was stated. Body mass index is a method of calculation from height and weight and is .not a questionnaire; if more explanation is needed, the authors will take it into consideration

.At the end of the discussion, the conclusion should come in a few separate lines. Response: Done

The number of references is large; in total, 35 to 40 references are enough, provided they are from reputable journals, and book sources and internet sources should be removed. Response: Done. One .or two book titles and internet sources that played an important role in the article were retained

.The RCT code should be stated. Response: Done

The text needs literary editing. Response: The number of references was reduced, but a limited number of book and internet sources were not removed given their importance; if further change is .needed, please tell us so that it is applied

Thank you

Reviewer 3:

1- Keywords: according to guideline of IJPBS,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/" "Internet-based cognitive-behavioral therapy "was not chosen from MESH. Thank you for your guidance and Keyword was set based on mesh

2- "iCBT" should be replaced by "ICBT" in the whole article. We agree with the reviewer and have revised it.

3- Introduction is very long, cut in half. The introduction was shortened but parts were added according to the opinion of other reviewers.

4- In method: explain more about online meetings. Was it held every day? How long was each session? Were participants able to chat in this group during the day or did they interact only within the time frame of each session? An explanation of how to hold online meetings was stated.

5- In method, Explain about the type of randomization. Your comments have been applied.

6- Please remove table 2 and briefly explain its content in the text. I deleted Table 2 and explained it in the text

7- References:Please use abbreviated name of the journals according to MEDLINE database. You also may find abbreviations on the Wikipedia website.
For non-English references, translate the title to English, enclose the translation in square brackets, and add an abbreviated language designator.
Write its DOI at the end of each reference. Thanks for explaining how to make the changes and Changes were made based on the description

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 22 Jun 2021

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 22 Jun 2021

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 process.
Thank you for your fine contribution. On behalf of the Editors of IJPBS, we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.