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://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijpbs.117369
Published in: Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 15(3); e117369

Peer Review Report for "Service Development and Implementation of an Exercise Therapy Unit in a Psychiatric Hospital in Iran: A Brief Report"

Author(s): Behnaz Tazesh, Mohammad Hossein Pourgharib Shahi , Azarakhsh Mokri, Hamidreza Naghavi, Sayedeh Elham Sharafi, Zahra Mirsepassi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	26 Jun 2021
Revised Date:	10 Jul 2021
Accepted Date:	10 Jul 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) 29 Jun 2021

Dear AE,
Thanks for submitting this valuable article. The authors can see my point of view in the attached file.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 29 Jun 2021

Dear EIC,
This is with further reference to the paper submitted for possible publication in IJPBS.
This paper has been carefully reviewed and it is suggested that the manuscript requires some minor revisions and should be modified according to the reviewers' comments which are appended below.
If they can satisfactorily reply to all the points raised by the reviewers, we would be pleased to consider a revised manuscript for further review. With the revised version, kindly upload an annotated list addressing each of the reviewers' comments and highlighting where changes have been made to the manuscript. This will facilitate and accelerate our assessment of the revised paper.

Thanks.

Mehran Zarghami: EIC | **Revision (0)** 29 Jun 2021

Dear Authors,
Your paper has been evaluated by external peer reviewers. Please do your revisions according to the reviewer's comments. I appreciate you doing the revisions as soon as possible by using the track changes mode in MS Word and using colored text.
After revision authors are obliged to upload reviewer's comments word file in which they have replied to all comments one by one.
Besides, please pay attention to the word count limitation:
Word count limits are declared in 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.
Thanks.

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 the reviewers comments:

1. Reviewer comment: Brief reports should contain:

- Introduction
- Methods
- A combined Results and Discussion section
- Acknowledgments
- Authorship Contributions
- Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest
- References

Response to the reviewer: The structure of the manuscript was edited according to the journal's guideline.

2. Reviewer comment: Mention the name of the hospital and the city.

Response to the reviewer: The names of the hospital and city were added as below:

This study aims to report our experience in the development and implementation of an exercise therapy unit in Roozbeh psychiatric hospital in Tehran, Iran.

3. Reviewer comment: Were the exclusion criteria checked by a sports and exercise medicine specialist?

Response to the reviewer: All patients were visited by a sports and exercise medicine specialist before the intervention and were excluded from the study if there was a contraindication for exercise therapy.

4. Reviewer comment: What was the average duration of participation in the program?

Response to the reviewer: The text was edited to indicate that the average duration of participation in the program was 24 days.

5. Reviewer comment: Did these individuals provide informed consent?

Response to the reviewer: This section was added in methods as below:

The study process was explained to the patients and if they were interested, they entered the study voluntarily.

6. Reviewer comment: Did you not receive feedback from patients participating in the program?

Response to the reviewer: At the end of each exercise therapy session, the nurse talked to the patients about their views on exercise therapy, but these comments were not recorded.

7. Reviewer comment: It is better to write “the first structured sports and exercise unit”. Because sports activities are performed in many occupational therapy departments.

Response to reviewer comment: The sentence was edited as below:

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first structured sports and exercise unit in psychiatric hospitals in Iran that provides services under the supervision of a multidisciplinary team.

8. Reviewer comment: You have not written anything about this before. This part needs to be explained, especially in the methods section.

Response to reviewer comment: More explanation was added in methods.

9. Reviewer comment: Only common abbreviations may be used without definition. Terms appearing frequently (three or more times) within a paper may be abbreviated, but should be spelled out at first citation, with the abbreviation following in parentheses.

Response to reviewer comment: This abbreviation has already been mentioned in the method section (line 54).

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.

Mehran Zarghami: EIC | **Revision (1)** 10 Jul 2021

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.
Thanks.