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://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijpbs.59421
Published in: Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: In Press(In Press); e59421

Peer Review Report for "Effects of Piracetam as an Adjuvant therapy on Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder: A Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Trial"

Author(s): Kaveh Alavi, Elham Shirazi, Maryam Akbari, Zahra Shahrivar, Fatemeh-Sadat Noori, Soosan Shirazi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 28 Oct 2019
Revised Date: 7 Sep 2020
Accepted Date: 3 Apr 2021

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) — 18 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
A few points are important about this manuscript:
1- Title and abstract are acceptable.
2- Introduction is insufficient and further explanation for the necessity of the implementation of the project is needed.
3- Manufacturer's name and address mention in parentheses in the methods section.
4- Please precisely identify all drug manifestations in the methods and materials section.
5- Please explain ethical considerations.
6- Results are acceptable.
6- Please expand the discussion section.
7- Please use and add newer references to list it.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 17 Aug 2020

Dear EIC,

1- In the background, studies on the use of Piracetam in ADHD and its effects should be noted.

2- If two items are not included in the study from the beginning, they will not be considered dropouts.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)**

28 Aug 2020

Dear Author,

Your paper has been evaluated by external peer reviewers. Please do your revisions according to the reviewers' comments. I appreciate you to do the revisions as soon as possible by using the track changes mode in MS Word and using colored text.

After revision authors are obliged to upload reviewers' comments word file 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.

Thanks.

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.

In the name of God

To: Editor-in-chief of the “Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences”

Dear professor Mehran Zarghami;

I am very thankful of the reviewers’ and editors’ valuable comments and have tried to follow them completely.

Reviewer 1:

1. Title and abstract are acceptable.

No change was commented.

2. Introduction is insufficient and further explanation for necessity of the implement of project is needed.

Explanation for the necessity of the project is completed, added to and highlighted in the background section.

3. Manufacturer’s name and address mention in parentheses in methods section.

It is added to and highlighted in the method section.

4. Please precisely identify all drugs manifestations in methods and material section.

They were added to and highlighted in the method section.

5. Please explain ethical consideration.

It is explained, completed, added to and highlighted in the method section.

6. Results are acceptable.

No change was commented.

7. Please expand the discussion section.

The discussion section is expanded and completed, and the added content is highlighted in this section.

8. Please use and add newer references.

Newer references were searched but only one relevant new reference was found which is used and added and highlighted in the references.

Associate Editor's Comments:

1. In the background, studies on the use of piracetam in ADHD and its effects should be noted.

They were completed and noted, added to, and highlighted in the background section.

2. If two items are not included in the study from the beginning, they will not be considered as dropouts.

It is corrected and highlighted in the method section.

I have to mention that because of performing the reviewers' comments, the word count of the manuscript which was 3450 previously, is exceeded to 3940 now, otherwise we could not follow their recommendations.

The authors hope that the revisions are appropriate and complete, and the article is acceptable for being published in your valuable journal.

Sincerely Yours,

Elham Shirazi (corresponding author)

2020. 09. 05

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 23 Mar 2021

Dear EIC,
The revised version is accepted.
Thanks.

Mehran Zarghami: EIC | **Revision** (1) 3 Apr 2021

Dear Author,
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. On behalf of the Editors of IJPBS, we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.
Thanks.