IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Volume 16 · Issue 2 · e120159

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Effectiveness of Online Group-mindfulness and Acceptance-based Therapy and Cognitive-behavioral Therapy on Misophonia

Sareh Ghorbani, Ahmad Ashouri, Banafsheh Gharraee, Hojjatollah Farahani

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
3 Nov 2021	27 Dec 2021	28 Jan 2022	10.5812/ijpbs-120159

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 7

1 Original submission

1 comment · 16 Dec 2021

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 16 Dec 2021

Your paper has been evaluated by external peer reviewers. Please make your revisions according to the reviewers' comments.

After revision, authors are obliged to upload a Word file containing the reviewers' comments, 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. The full manuscript file must be highlighted to indicate revised text.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Manuscript 120159

Response to Reviewers

Dear Dr. Zarghami**,**
Thank you for giving us the opportunity to submit a revised draft of the manuscript “Effectiveness of online group-mindfulness and acceptance-based therapy and cognitive-behavioral therapy in misophonia” for publication in the Journal *of Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences*. We appreciate the time and effort that you and the reviewers dedicated to providing feedback on our manuscript and are grateful for the insightful comments on and valuable improvements to our paper. We have incorporated most of the suggestions made by the reviewers. Those changes are highlighted within the manuscript. Please see below, in blue, for a point-by-point response to the reviewers’ comments and .concerns

:Reviewers' Comments to the Authors

Comments from Reviewer 1

?**Comment 1:** *In limitation part, what is the second limitation*

.**Author response**: Thank you for pointing this out. We have corrected the sentences .The revised text reads as follows on page 9

The results of the present study should be considered according to the following limitations: First,) participants' double stress due to coronavirus infection was a factor in participants' decline and the uncertain effect of treatment on variables such as stress and quality of life. Second, we also did not include a control group. Third, the sample size was low, and including a small sample of male (.individuals and the generalizability of the findings may be limited

.**Comment 2:** *It is better to write shortly about the contents of each session*

Author response: Thank you for pointing this out. We have added the suggested content to the .manuscript in table 1

:Reviewer 2

Greetings, and thank you for your efforts

Authors' response: Thank you for your attention

In the abstract1- The date and place of the study should be specified.2- The type of study should be added. The inclusion criteria and sampling method should be mentioned.3- The results should be fully .explained.4- The discussion should be rewritten5- Keywords should be based on MeSH

Authors' response: Thank you to the respected reviewer for the careful review. The date and place of the study, the type of study, the inclusion criteria and the sampling method were added. The results and discussion were revised, and the keywords were written based on MeSH. (The changes made in the main version are shown with yellow highlighting)

In the introduction6- There is no statement of the problem: what problems this condition causes and .what achievements the results of this study will have

Authors' response: Thanks to the respected reviewer for pointing out this issue. The problems that misophonia causes for those affected are reported in paragraph 2 of the Introduction, including emotional, physical and functional problems resulting from these individuals' avoidance in social and work relationships, and ultimately their quality of life. The achievements of the study are also explained in paragraph 5 of the Introduction (the relevant parts are shown with green highlighting in the .Introduction)

.Previous studies and their effectiveness should be mentioned -7

Authors' response: Thanking you for the suggestion, given the few studies conducted on the treatment of misophonia, these studies, which include cognitive behavioral therapy and acceptance- and mindfulness-based therapy, are explained in paragraph 4, together with their effectiveness and .problems. (The relevant parts are shown with green highlighting in the Introduction)

.The aim of the study should be stated separately in a few lines -8

Authors' response: The aim section was added to the study (shown with yellow highlighting on the third .page)

Method9- The type of study should be mentioned

Authors' response: The type of study is explained in section 3.1., page 3, in the first line (shown with .green highlighting)

.There are no inclusion and exclusion criteria -10

Authors' response: The inclusion and exclusion criteria were added in section 3.2., page 4 (shown with .yellow highlighting)

?By whom was the training delivered, and how was it -11

Authors' response: Section 3.3. about the therapist and treatment adherence was added according to the .respected reviewer's comment (shown with yellow highlighting on the third page)

For the questionnaires, the validity obtained in this study was mentioned. It should be stated how -12 the validity of these questionnaires was calculated in this study. Sample size, type of sample, method of .reliability and validation, etc

Authors' response: Each of the questionnaires completed by the participants in the present study was analyzed, and the Cronbach's alpha of each was calculated, and the final report has been added at the end of the description of each instrument. If the respected reviewer deems it appropriate, this part of the .description can be deleted

?In the results13- What were the confounding variables of the study, and how were they controlled

Authors' response: The confounding variables included demographic characteristics (age, age at onset of misophonia, gender, education level, marital status, presence of misophonia in other family members, and comorbid disorders), and these effects were controlled by randomizing the allocation of the samples. A chi-square test was performed for each of these variables, and its results are reported in Table .2. (Shown with yellow highlighting on the sixth page)

.In the discussion14- Inconsistent studies should be added

Authors' response: Thanking the respected reviewer for the suggestion, unfortunately few studies on the treatment of misophonia have been published so far and have reached the authors, and all of them are .consistent with the present study

.The findings should be explained in the discussion -15

Authors' response: In accordance with the respected reviewer's comment, a section was added to the .Discussion to further explain the findings (shown with yellow highlighting on the ninth page)

The conclusion should be rewritten and devoted to the important findings -16

Authors' response: The conclusion was rewritten, and the unimportant parts were deleted (shown with .green highlighting on the tenth page)

We look forward to hearing from you in due time regarding our submission and to respond to any further .questions and comments you may have

,Sincerely

2021/12

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 28 Jan 2022

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 28 Jan 2022

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 with your cooperation in the editorial process.
Thank you for your fine contribution. On behalf of the Editors of IJPBS, we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.