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.115663
Published in: IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 16(1); e115663

Peer Review Report for "Evaluation of the Frequency of Post-traumatic Stress Disorder in Patients with COVID-19 Admitted to Hospitals in Sari, Iran in 2020"

Author(s): Seyed Hamzeh Hosseini, Forouzan Elyasi, Mahmood Moosazadeh, Ideh Ghafour

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	28 Apr 2021
Revised Date:	5 Sep 2021
Accepted Date:	30 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) — 7 May 2021

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 17 May 2021

Dear AE,

Thanks to the efforts of the research team, the following comments are recommended to the research team:
1. Modify keywords by title
2. In the Background section: Lines 47, 49, and 66 need a reference.
3. What study gap is there? How does this study reduce it?
4. The process of selecting hospitals and patients should be fully described. You said the

random sampling technique was practiced.

5. "the test results were correspondingly documented"(Based on the results of which tests (scan, PCR, o2 saturation?)

6. In the sample size section: What was the attrition rate considered when calculating the sample size?

7. In the Research Procedure section: The inclusion criteria for sample selection were a history of diagnosis of COVID-19 over the past two months. Explain why after 2 months. Do you have a reference?

8. Who filled out the questionnaire?

9. The study's objectives were explained to the patients, who were assured that their information would be kept confidential. Please add.

10. "Using phone contacts by a psychiatrist to call the infected patients, the PTSD criteria were thus measured based on the demographic characteristics questionnaire and the PTSD Checklist for the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition (DSM-5) (PCL-5)". Are PTSD criteria measured by demographic characteristics? Or are these variables related to factors?

11. "In this study, the cutoff point of 31 was taken into account" Please mention that this choice was based on the opinion of a psychiatrist, or epidemiologist, why? Is reference 13 for the choice of the present study or for the range between 28 and 38?

12. In the Ethical Considerations section: The satisfaction of the participants, the type of informed consent, and the satisfaction of the hospital director should be mentioned.

13. In the Result section: The results must either be written or in a table. Only report a brief section of the demographic profile at the beginning of the results. If it is mentioned in the table, mark it and explain the type of statistical test below.

14. In the Discussion section: In the first paragraph, was the prevalence in your study (19.1%) similar to the other two studies (29.5%) and (34.5%)?

15. "However, studies in China had reported lower prevalence rates." You can use this sentence in the introduction as a paradox to justify your study.

16. You can not speak with certainty about the reasons for other studies. You usually use maybe or can because...

17. Line 224 requires at least 2 references

18. In the discussion, it is necessary to compare all the results obtained with other studies and give reasons for the differences.

19. Acknowledgements: In this section, the research team of Mazandaran Medical Sciences should be thanked for supporting the project, patients for participating in the study, and hospital officials for providing patient records.

20. The table name should be revised due to the use of statistical tests which were used to compare the two groups

21. Match the reference writing format.

There are a few translation errors for example, in line 50, a sense of loneliness, line stigmatization is of the factors that the PTSD symptoms, among survivors of severe acute respiratory syndrome, Among individuals not meeting the diagnostic criteria, the PTSD, the patients' information were (was) obtained to complete the demographic characteristics,

……..

22. The similarity with other studies is low, based on plagiarism checker software.

Kind Regards,

¬ **REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision (0)** 31 May 2021

Dear AE,

There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
There is no mention of Source(s) of support in the form of grants.
The result was briefly described.
Actual P values were not described.

Kind Regards,

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

Thanks for taking the time to review the article.

Reviewer 1:

- There is no mention of Source(s) of support in the form of grants.
Answer: Added to the manuscript

- The result was briefly described.

Answer: The Results were rewritten.

- Actual P values were not described.

Answer: The P values in the manuscript are the actual P values. With three decimal places.

Reviewer 2:

1. Modify keywords by title.

Answer: Keywords rewritten

2. In Background section: Lines 47 , 49, and 66 need a reference.

Answer: The lines you've mentioned do continue and have references.

3. What study gap is there? How does this study reduce it?

Answer: Given the importance of psychological issues secondary to the COVID-19 pandemic with unclear consequences and the PTSD symptoms in this population, the present study was to investigate the frequency of PTSD in patients with COVID-19 admitted to the hospitals in the city of Sari, Iran. (Mentioned in objectives)

4. How to select hospitals, how to select patients should be fully described. you said the random sampling technique was practiced??????

Answer: In this cross-sectional study, All the patients admitted to the hospitals based in the city of Sari, Iran, with the diagnosis of COVID-19 were identified. For sampling purposes, the random sampling technique was practiced. The list of the patients affected with COVID-19 was also retrieved in terms of their hospitalization date and time (from the first case admitted to the hospitals to those diagnosed at the onset of the study).

5. "the test results were correspondingly documented"(Based on the results of which tests (scan, PCR, o2 saturation?)

Answer: The sentence is rewritten.

6. In sample size section: What was the amount of attrition rate considered in calculating the sample size?

Answer: The attrition rate is not related to this study

7. In Research Procedure section: The inclusion criteria for sample selection were a history of diagnosis of COVID-19 over the past two months. Explain why after 2 months? Do you have a reference?

Answer: Corrected to 1 month (Due to PTSD Criteria).

8. Who filled out the questionnaire?

Answer: A psychiatrist. It's mentioned in the manuscript.

9. The objectives of the study were explained to the patients. Patients were assured that their information would be kept confidential. These please add.

Answer: Added to the manuscript.

10. "Using phone contacts by a psychiatrist to call the infected patients, the PTSD criteria were thus measured based on the demographic characteristics questionnaire and the PTSD Checklist for the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, fifth Edition (DSM-5) (PCL-5)". Are PTSD criteria measured by demographic characteristics? Or are these variables related factors?

Answer: It's mentioned that PTSD has measured by PCL-5 Checklist.

11. "In this study, the cutoff point of 31 was taken into account" Please mention that this choice was based on the opinion of a psychiatrist, or epidemiologist, why? Is reference 13 for the choice of the present study or for the range between 28 and 38?

Answer: It's been a decision made by psychiatrists and the epidemiologist of the research group. Since the range is between 28-38.

12. In Ethical Considerations section: The satisfaction of the participants and the type of informed consent and the satisfaction of the hospital director should be mentioned.

Answer: Added to the manuscript.

13. In Result section: The results must either be written or in a table. Only report a brief section of the demographic profile at the beginning of the results. If it is mentioned in the table, mark it and explain the type of statistical test below.

Answer: Results rewritten.

14. In Discussion section: In the first paragraph, was the prevalence in your study (19.1%) similar to the other two studies (29.5%) and (34.5%)?

Answer: Not similar, but consistent.

15. "However, studies in China had reported lower prevalence rates" You can use this sentence in the introduction as paradoxes to justify your study.

Answer: Added to the introduction.

16. You can not speak with certainty about the reasons for other studies. Usually use maybe or can because ....

Answer: Rewritten.

17. Line 224 requires at least 2 references.

Answer: The references are added.

18. In the discussion, it is necessary to compare all the results obtained with other studies and give reasons for the difference.

Answer: Results rewritten.

19. Acknowledgements: In this section, the research team of Mazandaran Medical Sciences needs to be thanked for supporting the project, thanking patients for participating in the study, and hospital officials for providing patient records.

Answer: Added to the manuscript

20. The table name should be revised due to the use of statistical tests which were used to compare the two groups

21. Match the reference writing format.
There are few translation errors for example in line 50 a sense of loneliness, line stigmatization are of the factors, that the PTSD symptoms, among survivors of the severe acute respiratory syndrome, Among

individuals not meeting the diagnostic criteria, the PTSD, the patients' information were (was) obtained to complete the demographic characteristics,……..

Answer: Corrected

22. The similarity with other studies is low, based on plagiarism checker software.

Answer: Thank you.

Reviewer3:

1-This article needs to serious English editing.

Answer: English writing edited.

2-line13:
Why you used the old version of SPSS for data analysis? And which tests are used for data analysis?

Answer: It was available to us and the required tests could be done with this version.

3- line 62:please insert references.

Answer: Reference is inserted.

4-line 80: you refer results of studies but only one reference is inserted.

Answer: The studies are discussed above.

5-line 98: 196 or 199 participants?

Answer: ***Considering these results, the confidence interval (CI) of 95%, the precision rate of 0.07, and the implementation of the ratio estimation formula below, a total number of 196 individuals were finally estimated.***

6-line 126: Please insert reference.

Answer: Reference is inserted.

7-line 205: Discussion is not written appropriately.

Answer: Discussion rewritten.

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) — 15 Dec 2021

Dear AE,

The reviewers' comments have been considered in the revised version of the manuscript. Except, in line 48, it is recommended to use "panic disorder" instead of "attack," where the names of other psychiatric disorders have been mentioned. Also, some of the sentences need to be native English writing.

Kind Regards,

Sussan Moudi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 15 Dec 2021

Dear EIC,

The reviewer's comments have been considered in the revised version of the manuscript. Except in line 48, it is recommended to use "panic disorder" instead of "attack," where the names of other psychiatric disorders have been mentioned. Also, some of the sentences need to be native English writing.

Kind Regards,
AE

Mehran Zarghami: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 30 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