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-114670
Published in: IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 16(3); e114670

Peer Review Report for "The Correlation Between Mental Health and Corona Anxiety Among Pre-hospital Emergency Medicine Clinicians Abstract"

Author(s): Sima Ghezelbash, Fatemeh Ghaedi-Heidari, Reza Sotodeh, Maryam Khosravi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	4 Apr 2021
Revised Date:	19 May 2022
Accepted Date:	28 Jul 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) 30 Apr 2021

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

Thank You for sending the manuscript title:
"Mental Health Outcomes among Operational Staff of pre-Hospital
Emergency during COVID-19 Outbreak in Iran
It is a good manuscript and it is good in terms of methodology
Please see the following comments to help your work:
1. The title can be changed to the correlation between mental health and Corona Anxiety
2. Please omit the demographics from the abstract and report your main results
3. Revise the conclusion of the abstract it is not clear
4. There are several studies you can use in your background
for example Healthcare provider's experience of working during the COVID-19 pandemic: A qualitative study
They used prehospital personnel in their study
5. Objective: please delete "due to the lack of a similar study"
6. Please explain Snowball Sampling, how you use it
7. You can use linear regression to explain the effect of anxiety on general health

Thank you

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 7 May 2021

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

1. Results section is too short
2. Results could interpreted and written differently
3. Inclusion and exclusion criteria haven't been described

Kind regards,

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 20 Jun 2021

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

Your study design is cross-sectional and the method used to analyze the data is correlation and regression and authors mentioned "A descriptive-correlational study design was used" in the method section and abstract.
Is there another innovative aspect to the research other than the sample used (e.g. Operational Staff of pre-hospital Emergency)?
GHQ validity has been reported .90. What kind of validity does this correlation coefficient indicate? (If it is a criterion, why was the criterion questionnaire not reported)
As a result, you mentioned "The results of multivariate linear regression with enter method". Did you arrange the entering order of regression equation variables and based on what logic? You say that used Enter method.

Kind regards

Sussan Moudi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 30 Nov 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) 3 Dec 2021

Dear Authors,

Thank you for your recent revisions.

Your paper has now been evaluated again. According to the reviewers 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.

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.

Reply to reviewers

- **The title can be changed to the correlation between mental health and Corona Anxiety.**

We applied the valuable comment.

- **Please omit the demographics from the abstract and report your main results**

We applied the valuable comment.

- **Revise the conclusion of abstract it is not clear.**

We applied the valuable comment.

- **There are several studies you can use in your background for example Healthcare providers experience of working during the COVID-19 pandemic: A qualitative study. They used pre-hospital personnel in their study.**

We applied the valuable comment.

- **Objective: please delete "due to the lack of a similar study"**

We applied the valuable comment.

- **Please explain Snowball Sampling, how did you use it.**

We actually used convenience sampling.

- **Your study design is cross-sectional and the method used to analyze the data is correlation and regression and authors mentioned “A descriptive-correlational study design was used” in method section and abstract.**

We applied the valuable comment.

- **Is there another innovative aspect to the research other than the sample used (e.g. Operational Staff of pre-Hospital Emergency) ?**

This quantitative study is the first study conducted specifically on pre-hospital emergency personnel and examines the relationship between mental health variables and Corona anxiety. In most studies, general anxiety questionnaires were used, but in the study a questionnaire special for Corona anxiety was used.

- **GHQ validity has been reported .90. What kind of validity does this correlation coefficient indicate? (If it is a criterion, why was the criterion questionnaire not reported)**

We corrected this section.

- **In result, you mentioned "The results of multivariate linear regression with enter method". Did you arrange the entering order of regression equation variables and based on what logic? You tell that used Enter method.**

In Enter model, all independent variables are entered into the model simultaneously to determine the effect of all important and unimportant variables on the dependent variable. We use this model. Therefore, we didn't arrange the order of variables.

- **Results section is too short.**

All of the results according to the objective of the study were reported. This section has 251 words.

- **Results could interpret and written differently.**

The sections of results and discussion are separate from each other.

- **Inclusion and exclusion criteria haven't described.**

We applied the valuable comment.

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)** 16 Mar 2022

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

some sections still need to be revised. They have been listed as follows:
1- Tables 2 and 3 are not clear. P-values should be well-presented, and each table should be a good presentation for the improvement of the readers' information. Each subdomain should be obvious and clear.
2- Please check the English writing of the keywords; also, some of the keywords (such as prehospital personnel) have not been listed in the main heading terms of the MeSH.

Kind regards,

Sussan Moudi: Associate Editor | **Revision (1)** 16 Mar 2022

Dear EIC,

Some sections still need to be revised. They have been listed as follows:
1- Tables 2 and 3 are not clear. P-values should be well-presented, and each table should be a good presentation for the improvement of the readers' information. Each subdomain should be obvious.
2- The English writing of the keywords; also, some of the keywords (such as prehospital personnel) have not been listed in the main heading terms of the MeSH.

Kind regards,
AE

Mehran Zarghami: EIC | **Revision (1)** 19 Mar 2022

Dear Authors,

Thank you for your recent revisions.
Your paper has now been evaluated again. According to the reviewers' and associate editor's comments, it needs some more revisions. Please do your revisions according to these comments. I appreciate you to do the revisions as soon as possible. The full

manuscript file must be highlighted to indicate revised texts.

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.

Reply to reviewers

- *Tables 2 and 3 are not clear. P-values should be well-presented; and each table should be a good presentation for improvement of the readers' information. Each subdomain should be obvious and clear.*

We applied the valuable comment.

- *Please check the English writing of the keywords; also, some of the keywords (such as prehospital personel) have not been listed in main heading terms of the MeSH.*

We applied the valuable comment.

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) 25 Jul 2022

Dear EIC,

The review process has been completed, and the manuscript has been considered for publication in the IJPBS journal.

Kind regards,
AE

¬ **Mehran Zarghami**: EIC | **Revision** (2) 28 Jul 2022

Dear Authors,

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 kind contribution, and we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.

Kind regards,
EIC