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-126620
Published in: IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 16(2); e126620

Peer Review Report for "Psychiatric Inpatients' Lived Experiences of Physical Restraint: A Qualitative Study in Iran"

Author(s): Seyyed Taha Yahyavi, Zahra Shahvari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	15 Apr 2022
Revised Date:	1 May 2022
Accepted Date:	14 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) — 22 Apr 2022

Dear AE,

In my opinion, this article is suitable for publication in the journal. But it needs minor revisions. See the suggested corrections and comments in the attached file.

Kind regards,

Mehran Zarghami: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 22 Apr 2022

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,
AE

Mehran Zarghami: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 22 Apr 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.

We thank reviewers for their careful reading and valuable comments. In the following, we highlight general concerns of reviewers and our effort to address these concerns:

1. A structured abstract is required including these headings:

- **Background**
- **Objectives**
- **Methods**
- **Results**
- **Conclusions**

Done. We Changed it

2. A list of three to five keywords should be included below the abstract in alphabetical order, and should be taken from those recommended by the US National Library of Medicine's Medical Subject Headings (MESH) browser list.

Done. We Changed it

3. For the original research, traditional sections are required including: **Background, Objectives (optional), Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusion, References, Acknowledgments**

Done. We Changed it

4. This Journal accepts references according to the Vancouver style.

Done. We Changed references to the Vancouver style

5. Please add the “Ethical Committee” approval code.

Done. We add the “Ethical Committee” approval code. This research has been approved by the Ethics Committee of the Medical School of Tehran University of Medical Sciences with the code: IR.TUMS.MEDICINE.REC.1398.504, and certify that the study was performed in accordance with the ethical standards as laid down in the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

6. These statements seem to have a meaning other than punishment. A 45-year-old man perceived physical restraint as an opportunity to reflect and said: *"I thought to myself ... why I did make that mistake? Why did I break hospital law? Restraint doesn't really bother me. Someone might think that restraint is annoying. But in fact, they were helping. They did not want to bother anybody. I broke the law. They fastened me to the bed so I could be alone with myself and think. Therefore, I had time to reflect on what I had done before and what I need to do in the future."* Obviously, this may not work as a treatment.

Given that punishment consists of three subgroups—waiting for freedom, opportunity for reflection, and waiting for recovery—this quotation falls under the category of opportunity for reflection.

7. Please revise the references according to the guidelines of the journal.

- Please use abbreviated name of the journals according to MEDLINE database. You also may find abbreviations on the Wikipedia website.

Done.

- References are not in accordance with Vancouver style completely.

Done. References are changed in accordance with Vancouver style completely.

- If it is needed to reference a journal article written by more than six authors, should be listed six authors names followed by "et al. ". This matter has not been considered in this paper.

Done.

- Add the DOI of all the articles at the end of them.

Done.

- At the end of the references that are books, in addition to the name of the publisher, write the city of the place of publication.

Done.

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) 14 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) 14 May 2022

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, and we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.

Kind regards,
EIC