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.117313
Published in: IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 16(1); e117313

Peer Review Report for "Temperament and Personality Traits in Patients with Chronic Spontaneous Urticaria: A Cross-sectional Study"

Author(s): Maryam Khoshkhui, Maedeh Kamrani, Maryam Emadzadeh, Zahra Jafari, farhad faridhoseini

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 23 Jun 2021
Revised Date: 8 Oct 2021
Accepted Date: 10 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)

28 Jul 2021

Dear AE,

There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1. Please indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract.
2. Please explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported.
3. Please state specific objectives, including any specified hypotheses.
4. Please clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable.
5. Please describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias.
6. Please explain how the study size was arrived at.
7. Please indicate the number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest.
8. Please Discuss the limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both the direction and magnitude of any potential bias.

Kind Regards,

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

Dear AE,

In the article, it would be more appropriate to write the marked place as 'interested' in the general sentence ‘Regarding the relationship between personality factors and chronic spontaneous urticaria 123 [27], the researchers are interested in this issue as a psychodermatological problem.’

‘’While, there were correlations between duration of disease and subscales of reward dependence, self-directedness, and self-transcendence.’’ With this sentence, the message intended to be given by the authors has not been fully understood, and it is recommended that the message be reviewed again.

The study's results were repeatedly underlined in the article, but the researchers were insufficient in commenting on and discussing the cause-effect relationship of the subgroups that correlated with the diagnosis of chronic urticaria or the results that would be reflected in the clinic.

Kind Regards,

Fatemeh Sheikhmoonesi: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 8 Aug 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)** 18 Aug 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.

Response to Reviewers Comments

Temperament and Character Properties in Patients with Chronic Spontaneous Urticaria: A cross-sectional study

Dear Editorial Office of “Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences"

Hello, hope you are doing well,

I am very much thankful to the reviewers for their deep and thorough review. I have revised my present research paper in light of their useful suggestions and thought-provoking comments. I hope my revision has improved the paper to a level of satisfaction. I have included the response to each and every comments of the respected reviewers immediately after the comment in this letter. I hope the responses address the reviewers’ comments properly. I am eagerly looking forward to hearing from you considering this revised manuscript.

Stay Safe, Sincerely

Reviewer 1:

Comment: Please indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract

Response: Thank you so much for your comment. We stated the cross-sectional method in both title and the abstract.

Comment: Please explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported.

Response: The scientific background and rationale for the investigation is provided in the introduction section.

Comment: Please clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable. Please describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias

Response: The diagnostic criteria are provided in the methods section, and cofounders and sources of bias are provided at the end of discussion section.

Comment: Please explain how the study size was arrived at.

Response: The estimation of sample size is provided in the method section.

Comment: Please indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest

Response: The participants with missing data were excluded from the study.

Comment: Please discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias

Response: The limitation and possible bias are provided in the discussion section.

Reviewer 2:

Comment: In the article, it would be more appropriate to write the marked place as 'interested' in the general sentence ‘Regarding to the relationship between personality factors and chronic spontaneous urticaria 123 [27], the researchers interested to this issue as a psychodermatological problem. ’While, there were correlations between duration of disease and subscales of reward dependence, self-directedness and self-transcendence.’’ With this sentence, the message intended to be given by the authors has not been fully understood and it is recommended to review it again. The results obtained from the study were underlined repeatedly in the article, but the researchers were insufficient in commenting and discussing the cause-effect relationship of the sub-groups that correlated with the diagnosis of chronic urticaria, or the results that would be reflected in the clinic.

Response: Thank you so much for your comment, we revised the manuscript in the light of your comments.

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.

Fatemeh Sheikhmoonesi: Associate Editor | **Revision (1)** 23 Sep 2021

Dear EIC,
Please ask the authors to revise their article according to the IJPBS style:
A structured abstract is required including these headings:
• Background
• Objectives
• Methods
• Results
• Conclusions

For the original research, traditional sections are required including:
• Background
• Objectives
• Methods
• Results
• Discussion
• Conclusion
• References
Acknowledgments

The ethical code number is necessary. Please write it in method section.

Kind Regards,
AE

Mehran Zarghami: EIC | **Revision (1)** 27 Sep 2021

Dear Authors,

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 appreciate you doing the revisions as soon as possible using the track changes mode in MS Word and colored text.

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.

Response to Reviewers Comments

Temperament and Character Properties in Patients with Chronic Spontaneous Urticaria: A cross-sectional study

Dear Editorial Office of “Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences"

Hello, hope you are doing well,

I hope my revision has improved the paper to a level of satisfaction.

I am eagerly looking forward to hearing from you considering this revised manuscript.

Comment*:*

Associate Editor 1:
Dear Author,
Please revise your article according to IJPBS style:
A structured abstract is required including these headings:
• Background
• Objectives
• Methods
• Results
• Conclusions

For the original research, traditional sections are required including:
• Background
• Objectives
• Methods
• Results
• Discussion
• Conclusion
• References
Acknowledgments

Response: Thank you so much for your comment. We stated the headings in both abstract and the original research.

Comment:

Ethical code number is necessary. Please write it in method section.

Thank you so much for your useful comment. The ethical code number was added.

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.

Fatemeh Sheikhmoonesi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 27 Nov 2021

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.
AE

Mehran Zarghami: EIC | **Revision** (2) 10 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