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-130337
Published in: IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 16(4); e130337

Peer Review Report for "Decoding Selective Attention and Cognitive Control Processing Through Stroop Interference Effect: An Event-Related Electroencephalography-Derived Study"

Author(s): Razieh Kamali-Ardekani, Alireza Tavakkoli Neishabouri, Mojtaba Rabiei, Mohammadreza Alizadeh, Ali Yoonessi, lshafaghi@razi.tums.ac.ir lshafaghi@razi.tums.ac.ir, Mahmoudreza Hadjighassem

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	30 Jul 2022
Revised Date:	14 Nov 2022
Accepted Date:	2 Dec 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) — 29 Sep 2022

Dear AE,

The authors have done amazing work. But I want to ask you to polish the English of your "manuscript" again.

"Conflict of Interests: The authors have no conflicts of interest relevant to this [article].

With all due respect, your work is not an article; it is a "manuscript".

Kind Regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 7 Oct 2022

Dear AE,

Writing in English is not fluent. Given that this is a general psychiatry journal, adequate explanations of the Stroop, how it is performed, and its components are required. The Stroop technique, as well as elements including temperature, the viewer's viewing angle, the monitor's size, and the viewer's distance from the screen, all have an impact on EEG. Congruence and incongruence should both be defined. Additionally, the trial layout should be displayed; it is preferable for the authors to do so with a figure. The abstract does not mention the number of participants. Nine participants are mentioned in the methodology, but it later becomes clear that only 7 people took part in the study. It is not sufficient for participants to state subjectively that they do not have any psychiatric disorders. Patients with psychotic disorders, including those with delusional disorders, are unaware of their illness.

Kind Regards,

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision (0)** 12 Oct 2022

Dear AE,

It is a good topic. There are just a few questions from the authors:

1. How is the sample size determined?
2. What international approvals do the devices use to have?
3. What standards does the software use to have?

Best regards

Mehran Zarghami: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 16 Oct 2022

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication but also suggested 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)** 16 Oct 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.

Response to Reviewers

Dear Editorial Board of the Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences,

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to submit a revised draft of my manuscript titled "*Decoding Selective Attention and Cognitive Control Processing Through the Stroop Interference Effect: An Event-Related Electroencephalography-Derived Study*". We appreciate the time and effort that you and the reviewers have dedicated to providing your valuable feedback on my manuscript. We are grateful to the reviewers for their insightful comments on my paper. We have been able to incorporate changes to reflect most of the suggestions provided by the reviewers. Both reviewers 1 and 3 mentioned the English language improvement; a native English speaker checked and corrected the text. We have highlighted the changes within the manuscript.

> ***Reviewer 1:*** *Writing in English is not fluent. Given that this is a general psychiatry journal, adequate explanations of the Stroop, how it is performed, and its components are required. The Stroop technique, as well as elements including temperature, the viewer's viewing angle, the monitor's size, and the viewer's distance from the screen, all have an impact on EEG. Congruence and incongruence should both be defined. Additionally, the trial layout should be displayed; it is preferable for the authors to do so with a figure. The abstract makes no mention of the number of participants. Nine participants are mentioned in the methodology, but it later becomes clear that only 7 people took part in the study. It is not sufficient for participants to state subjectively that they do not have any psychiatric disorders. Patients with psychotic disorders, including those with delusional disorders, are unaware of their illness.*

Responses to Reviewer 1:

We thank the reviewer for pointing out these valuable comments.

1. We tried to improve the level of language fluency. We also used from a formal language editing service for better corrections. The certificate of edition and plagiarism are also attached to the current resubmission.

2. The Stroop task, the associated parameters, congruence and incongruence (in the introduction part), and the physical and environmental properties of the task performance situations (in the method part) were explained and highlighted. A figure was added to provide a more explanatory illustration.

3. The total number of participants were 9 and the total number of correct trials were 96 that obtained from these 9 participants (each subject performed several trials). The exact number of participants was corrected and mentioned throughout the text. Within the Table 1, we displayed the classification values for three sample trials out of 96. Accordingly, we corrected the relevant part in the text and highlighted it.

4. Regarding the state of the possible psychiatric disorders, a clinical psychologist retrospectively performed a telephone-based unstructured interview. One of them reported the existence of current anxiety-related traits (that do not fulfill the criteria of any items of the anxiety category in DSM-5). Explanations related to this part were also added to the relevant section of the text and highlighted. Additionally, for providing more information regarding the psychological states of the participants, we added a part explaining the results of Persian version of PANAS (Positive and Negative Affect Schedule).

Response to Reviewer 2:

> *It is a good topic. There are just a few questions.*
> *1. How is the sample size determined?*
> *2. What international approvals do the devices used have?*
> *3. What standards does the used software have?*

1. Thanks for this question; this investigation was performed in a pilot set to clear the dimensions of the instrument and software. Since the previous works had also used an approximate sample size, we selected this number.
2. The standard codes of device and software were provided in the method part and highlighted as well.

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) 2 Dec 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