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-120043
Published in: IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 16(2); e120043

Peer Review Report for "Assessing the Validity and Reliability of the Dimensional Anhedonia Rating Scale (DARS) for the Iranian Population"

Author(s): Yazdan Naderi Rajeh, Abbas Pourshahbaz, Behrooz Dolatshahi, Mehran Zarghami

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	6 Oct 2021
Revised Date:	17 Feb 2022
Accepted Date:	21 May 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) — 10 Oct 2021

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

1. The manuscript is written with very poor English and in need of editing.
2. The research problem is not clearly defined; for example problems with other tools that measure anhedonia are briefly mentioned and need further explanation.
3. It is necessary to specify the age range for participants, including the minimum and maximum age, as inclusion criteria.
4. Specify how you calculate the sample size.
5. In the Measures section, validity needs to be reported in addition to reliability.
6. The interval between test and retest is reported to be 2 to 3 weeks in one place and 3 weeks in another.
7. Test-retest results are reported differently in the results section and the discussion section.
8. What is the purpose of examining the gender difference in DARS score?
9. “the Iranian version of DARS, which previously measured only self-fulfilling pleasure, can be measured from various components of interest, motivation, effort,

and self-fulfilling pleasure." What does this sentence mean?

Kind regards,

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 22 Oct 2021

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

The whole article needs literal revision; some sentences seems incomplete, for example: The findings of this analysis have shown acceptable stability across the DARS and all four components with significant ICC between Time 1 and Time (line 164 to 166)
Please explain clearly from where and how you selected the sample. describe the exact way you chose the participants
In page 5 you speaks of four domains of hedonic responses in DARS but you haven't mentioned them; please add them in this part.

Kind regards,

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 24 Oct 2021

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

- In keywords please add depression.
- For the first time, please write the MDD in full in the introduction section.
- The Iranian language is not editorially correct. Please replace it with the Iranian population or the Persian language.

Kind regards,

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 4 Nov 2021

the comment are recorded in the manuscript

Yazdan Naderi Rajeh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 31 Dec 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) 9 Jan 2022

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.

Reviewer 1:
- In keywords please add depression.

Authors reply: Many thanks for your comment. Depression added in keywords

- For the first time, please write the MDD in full in the introduction section.

Authors reply: MDD (Major Depression Disorder)

- The Iranian language is not editorially correct. Please replace it with the Iranian population or the Persian language.

Authors reply: Many thanks. Iranian language replaced by Iranian population.

Reviewer 2:
The whole article needs literal revision; some sentences seems incomplete, for example: The findings of this analysis have shown acceptable stability across the DARS and all four components with significant ICC between Time 1 and Time (line 164 to 166)

Authors reply: An English language expert reviewed the entire text and the corrected items were highlighted.

Please explain clearly from where and how you selected the sample. describe the exact way you chose the participants

Authors reply: In such a way that after distributing the announcement in cyberspace (Instagram, telegram, Whatsapp), the form of the handouts was sent to the participants.

In page 5 you speaks of four domains of hedonic responses in DARS but you haven't mentioned them; please add them in this part.

Authors reply: Many thanks. (hobbies, sensory experience, social activities, and food/drink).

Reviewer 3:
the comment are recorded in the manuscript

Authors reply: Many thanks . All comments have been corrected

Reviewer 4:
1. The manuscript is written with very poor English and in need of editing.

Authors reply: Many thanks An English language expert reviewed the entire text and the corrected items were highlighted.

2. The research problem is not clearly defined; for example problems with other tools that measure anhedonia are briefly mentioned and need further explanation.

Authors reply: Many thanks. we have now modified the manuscript to reflect this change

3. It is necessary to specify the age range for participants, including the minimum and maximum age, as inclusion criteria.

Authors reply: (Age range between 18 and 55 years)

4. Specify how you calculate the sample size.

Authors reply: Many thanks.previous research mentioned the sample size needed for exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis is between 200 and 50

Wéry A, Billieux J. Problematic cybersex: Conceptualization, assessment, and treatment. Addictive behaviors. 2017 Jan 1;64:238-46.

5. In the Measures section, validity needs to be reported in addition to reliability.

Authors reply: Many thanks.The DARS also demonstrated good convergent and divergent validity with Snaith–Hamilton Pleasure Scale (SHAPS)

6. The interval between test and retest is reported to be 2 to 3 weeks in one place and 3 weeks in another.

Authors reply: Many thanks.The interval of test-retest was three weeks.

7. Test-retest results are reported differently in the results section and the discussion section.

Authors reply: Many thanks. The interval of test-retest was three weeks.

8. What is the purpose of examining the gender difference in DARS score?

Authors reply: Given that depressive disorder is more common in women and that previous studies have examined this difference, the researchers in the present study sought to replicate previous findings.

9. “the Iranian version of DARS, which previously measured only self-fulfilling pleasure, can be measured from various components of interest, motivation, effort, and self-fulfilling pleasure.” What does this sentence mean?

Authors reply: An English language expert reviewed the entire text and the corrected items were highlighted.

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 21 May 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** (1) 21 May 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