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-118336
Published in: IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 16(2); e118336

Peer Review Report for "Safe Traffic Behaviors in Adolescents: A Cross-sectional Study Based on the Theory of Planned Behavior"

Author(s): Alireza Shahab Jahanlou , Laleh Hassani, vahid ranaei, Ghodratollah Roshanaei , Sonja Forward, Kristin Haglund, Forouzan Rezapur-Shahkolai

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	9 Oct 2021
Revised Date:	30 Jan 2022
Accepted Date:	19 Mar 2022

Revision (0)

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 (0)** 3 Dec 2021

Dear Authors,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript for consideration for publication in Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences. Your article was initially reviewed. It is recommended that you rewrite the article in the form of a “Brief Report” and re-submit it for review.

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.

1- EIC Decision:

Thank you for submitting your manuscript for consideration for publication in Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences. Your article was initially reviewed. It is recommended that you rewrite the article in the form of a “Brief Report” and re-submit it for review.

Response to editor in chief:

Dear Editor in Chief, Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences

We would like to thank you for your email and the constructive comment.

We have rewritten the article in the form of Brief Report” and we have re-submitted the paper for review. We have highlighted the changes in yellow color in the revised manuscript.

We really hope you will find the revised manuscript acceptable and look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours and best regards,

2- Uploaded Files by Reviewers/Associate Editor/EIC:

Below you can find list of files attached by reviewers or associate editor or EIC during the review process (if any).

No file

Response to reviewers:

As you can find in email and site, there aren’t any files or comments from reviewers. We have revised the manuscript according to the valuable comments of dear editor in chief. We have highlighted the changes in yellow color in the revised manuscript.

We really hope you will find the revised manuscript acceptable and look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours and best regards,

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)** 20 Dec 2021

Dear AE,

There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
In this cross-sectional study, the authors investigate safe traffic behaviors in male students based on the theory of planned behavior. The overall level of the brief report is very good: even if it is quite simple, it is well written, easily accessible, and highlights some important considerations. The Background, Materials, and Methods sections provide useful information for the readers. This brief report has the potential to be accepted, but some points have to be clarified or fixed.
Given the shortcomings below, the manuscript requires minor revisions. If such changes were incorporated, I would be happy to recommend it for publication.

Title:
--The title is proper and reflects the content appropriately. However, I recommend the authors to replace “adolescents” instead of “male students” in the title.
Abstract and keywords:
--The abstract describes the content accurately.
--Write the unabbreviated form of “SD” in the abstract.
-- Add the word “and” before “40.6%”.
--Revise “40.1% (166 people) of students 11 went to school on foot and 11.6% (48 people) by bicycle. 51.69% (214 people) always fasten seat 12 belt in car.” to “40.1% (166 people) and 11.6% (48 people) of students went to school on foot and bicycle, respectively and 51.69% (214 people) of students always fasten seat belt in the car.”
--The keywords are selected from MESH. Include “cross-sectional study” in the keywords.

Background:
--Merge the sentences in lines 41 and 42.
--Include reference “(9)” in line 46 and remove the space after “behaviors” in line 56.
Objective:
--It is clearly stated.
Materials and methods:
--The study design is sufficient, and the power of the study is declared.
--Lines 68 to 70 is not clear. Revise it.
--Replace “The self-administrate questionnaire had two parts; the first part included seven

demographic variables. The second part was based on the TPB about STBs." "The self-administered questionnaire had two parts. The first part included seven demographic variables and the second part was based on the TPB about STBs."
--Write the unabbreviated forms of CVI and CVR.
--Revise lines 94 and 95.
Results:
--It is a brief report with four tables. Delete Table 2, but keep the explanations in the text.
References:
--Remove the old references.
--Revise the author's names in reference 14.

Kind Regards,

Fatemeh Sheikhmoonesi: Associate Editor | **Revision (1)** 17 Jan 2022

Dear EIC,
The resubmitted article did not follow the IJPBS Style. According to IJPBS style, in the brief report :

Abstracts must not exceed 200 words and should be a single paragraph with no subheadings.

_____

Full text:
Brief reports may contain:
• Introduction
• Methods
• A combined Results and Discussion section
• Acknowledgments
• Authorship Contributions
• Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest
• References

• In a brief report, the maximum number of:
o Tables or figures are 2
o References are 20

Word Count: 1500

Kind Regards,
AE

Mehran Zarghami: EIC | **Revision (1)** 20 Jan 2022

Dear Authors,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript for consideration for publication in Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences. Your article was initially reviewed. It is

recommended that you rewrite the article in the form of a “Brief Report” and re-submit it for review.

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 letter

Journal Name: Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences

Manuscript title: Safe traffic behaviors in male students: a cross-sectional study based on the theory of planned behavior

Manuscript ID: 118336

We would like to thank you and anonymous reviewers who provided helpful and constructive comments to improve the paper. All deletions and/or additions suggested by reviewers have been incorporated into the manuscript. Below you will find the response to each of the comments. The comments are in black and our responses are in blue color. In the revised manuscript, the changes are highlighted in green color.

We really hope you will find the revised manuscript acceptable and look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours,

On behalf of the co-authors

Reviewer comments:

In this cross-sectional study, the authors investigate safe traffic behaviors in male students based on the theory of planned behavior. The overall level of the brief report is very good: even if it is quite simple, it is well written easy accessible and some important considerations are highlighted. The Background and Materials and Methods sections provide useful information for the readers. This brief report has the potential to be accepted, but some points have to be clarified or fixed.Given the below shortcomings the manuscript requires minor revisions. If such changes were incorporated, I would be happy to recommend the manuscript for publication.

Title:
--The title is proper and reflects the content appropriately. However, I recommend the authors to replace “adolescents” instead of “male students” in the title.

Response:

Thank you. We have revised it.

Abstract and keywords:
--The abstract describes the content accurately.

--Write the unabbreviated form of “SD” in the abstract.
-- Add the word “and” before “40.6%”.
--Revise “40.1% (166 people) of students 11 went to school on foot and 11.6% (48 people) by bicycle. 51.69% (214 people) always fasten seat 12 belt in car.” to “40.1% (166 people) and 11.6% (48 people) of students went to school on foot and bicycle, respectively and 51.69% (214 people) of students always fasten seat belt in the car.”

--The keywords are selected from MESH. Include “cross-sectional study” in the keywords.

Response:

Thank you. We have revised it.

Background:
--Merge the sentences in line 41 and 42.
--Include reference “(9)” in line 46 and remove the space after “behaviors” in line 56.
Objective:
--It is clearly stated.
Materials and methods:
--The study design is sufficient and the power of study is declared.
--Line 68 to 70 is not clear. Revise it.
--Replace “The self-administrate questionnaire had two parts; first part included seven demographic variables. The second part was based on the TPB about STBs.” With “The self-administrate questionnaire had two parts. The first part included seven demographic variables and the second part was based on the TPB about STBs.”
--Write the unabbreviated forms of CVI and CVR.
--Revise lines 94 and 95.

Response:

Thank you. We have revised it.

Results:
--It is a brief report and there are four tables. Delete table 2, but keep the explanations in the text.
References:
--Remove the old references.
--Revise the author’s names in reference 14.

Response:

Thank you. We have revised it.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Dear Author,
your article has not reviewed yet, Editor in chief had asked you to report your article as brief report but resubmitted article was not according to IJPBS Style. according to IJPBS style, in brief report :

Abstracts must not exceed 200 words and should be a single paragraph with no subheadings.

_____
Full text:
Brief reports may contain:
• Introduction
• Methods
• A combined Results and Discussion section
• Acknowledgments
• Authorship Contributions
• Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest
• References
• In a brief report, the maximum number of:
o Tables or figures are 2
o References are 20

Word Count: 1500

Response:

Thank you. We have revised it. Word count was reduced to 1492. In revised manuscript abstract is 105 words with no subheadings, there are 2 tables and references are less than 20.

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 Feb 2022

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) 19 Mar 2022

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