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-113591
Published in: IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 16(2); e113591

Peer Review Report for "Anxiety, Depression, and Quality of Life in Caregivers of Children with Cleft Lip and Palate: A Systematic Review"

Author(s): Parastoo Namdar, Mehdi Pourasghar , Farzaneh Lal Alizadeh, Atena Shiva

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	8 Feb 2021
Revised Date:	25 Oct 2021
Accepted Date:	4 Feb 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) — 2 Apr 2021

Dear AE,

Thank you for asking my opinion about this review article.
Its structure (including critical appraisal of the papers and analysis method) is good. I decide to accept the paper.

Regards,

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 14 Apr 2021

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

1- I recommended some points in the attached file.
2- Please revise the keywords according to the Main Heading Terms of MeSH.
3- More recent evidence is available about the incidence of cleft lip and palate; please cite recent published articles.
4- According to the mentioned search strategy and eligibility criteria, some other articles

can be included in this manuscript; however, they have not been listed. For example:
1- The Burden and Perceived Stress on Family Caregivers of Patients with Orofacial Cleft Deformities in The Perioperative Period of Cleft Repair (First Published August 14, 2020). https://doi.org/10.1177/2374373520948650
2- Coping with Cleft: A Conceptual Framework of Caregiver Responses to Nasoalveolar Molding (2018). https://doi.org/10.1597/14-113
5- In Line 52, the sentence "papers in which children and parents were not separately examined were removed from the study" seems to be revised.
6- In Line 150, how often was the happiness training and teamwork program applied for the improvement of the psychological status of mothers of patients with CL/P?
7- Considering different results in the reviewed articles, it is recommended to represent a summary at the end of each part of the "Discussion" about the judgment of the authors about the main findings, and the similarities and differences of the reviewed articles with each other.
8- Please discuss limitations at the study and outcome level.
9- The Ethics Committee approval code has not been mentioned in the manuscript.

Kind regards,

Sussan Moudi: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 20 Jun 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript has been studied, and some comments should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.
Kind regards,
AE

Mehran Zarghami: EIC | **Revision (0)** 2 Jul 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.

Q: [Dear editor Thank you to ask my opinion about this review article. Its structure (including critical appraisal of the papers and analysis method) is good. My decision is acceptance of the paper

R: [Tanx]

Q: [I recommended some points in the attached file]

R: [Dear editor: It was considered and edited in the text]

Q: [Please revise the keywords according to Main Heading Terms of MeSH]

R: [Keywords was checked again based on MeSH]

Q: [More recent evidence is available about the incidence of cleft lip and palate; please cite to recent published articles]

R: [We update the articles. Three article were searched and added to the study. One of them is belong to 2021, when the When we finished writing this article. Probability the other articles has been under review at the time of writing this study.]

Q: [According to the mentioned search strategy and eligibility criteria, some other articles can be included in this manuscript; however, they have not been listed. For example]

R: [[It was considered. The inclusion and exclusion criteria was selected based on the view of two specialists]

Q: [The Burden and Perceived Stress on Family Caregivers of Patients with Orofacial Cleft Deformities in The Perioperative Period of Cleft Repair (First Published August 14, 2020). https://doi.org/10.1177/2374373520948650]

R: [[The Burden and Perceived Stress on Family Caregivers of Patients with Orofacial Cleft Deformities in The Perioperative Period of Cleft Repair: was entered in this study; probability it has been under review at the time of writing this study]

Q: [Coping with Cleft: A Conceptual Framework of Caregiver Responses to Nasoalveolar Molding (2018). https://doi.org/10.1597/14-113]

R: [However, the other study as "Coping with Cleft: A Conceptual Framework of Caregiver Responses to Nasoalveolar Molding" is an qualitative study and is not similar to our other studies. We included only studies that quantitatively assessed the anxiety and depression so that the studies are completely homogeneous.]

Q: [In Line 52, this sentence "papers in which children and parents were not separately examined were removed from the study" seems to be revised]

R: [why? Your comments is confusing]

Q: [In Line 150, how often was the happiness training and teamwork program applied for the improvement of the psychological status of mothers of patients with CL/P?]

R: [We just descripted it, which was reported in one study]

Q: [Considering different results in the reviewed articles, it is recommended to represent a summary at the end of each part of "Discussion" about the judgement of the authors about the main findings, the similarities and differences of the reviewed articles with each other]

R: [It had been considered and explained in discussion in details]

Q: [Please discuss limitations at study and outcome level]

R: [This is a systematic review not a clinical article. We have no limitations]

Q: [The Ethics Committee approval code has not been mentioned in the manuscript].

R: [This is a systematic review not a clinical article. The article is no approved by any Ethics Committee]

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)** 22 Aug 2021

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

Manuscript Full Title: Anxiety, Depression, and Quality of Life in Caregivers of Children with Cleft Lip and Palate: A Systematic Review
Thanks for revising the article. My comments have been considered in the revised article, except some points which are listed as below:
1- The IJPBS follows the PRISMA checklist for reporting of systematic reviews. According to this checklist, limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias) should be provided in "Discussion" section.
2- In Line 131: Is this sentence correct? "All the papers were prospective studies".
has not been mentioned? I don't know.

Sussan Moudi: Associate Editor | **Revision (1)** 11 Oct 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 (1)** 15 Oct 2021

Dear Authors,

Thank you for your recent revisions.
Your paper has now been evaluated again. According to the reviewer's 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.
Besides, review articles do not need an ethical approval code.

Kind regards,

EIC

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.

Anxiety, Depression, and Quality of Life in Caregivers of Children with Cleft Lip and Palate: A Systematic Review	
Reviewer 1: and Associate Editor's Comments My comments have been considered in the revised article, except some points which are listed as below:	
1- The IJPBS follows the PRISMA checklist for reporting of systematic reviews. According to this checklist, limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias) should be provided in "Discussion" section.	It was considered and edited in the text and highlighted
2- In Line 131: Is this sentence correct? "All the papers were prospective studies". has not been mentioned? I don’t know.	The current review only included prospective case-control studies with descriptive, comparative, or inventive processes in nature for the assessment of the QoL, stress, and depression in parents of children with CL/P.

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.

¬ **Sussan Moudi**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 18 Jan 2022

Dear EIC,

The recommended points have been considered in the revised article, and the paper is suitable for publication in this journal

Kind regards,
AE

¬ **Mehran Zarghami**: EIC | **Revision** (2) 4 Feb 2022

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.

Kind regards,
EIC