IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Volume 15 · Issue 3 · e77176

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Frequency of Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder and Its Patterns in Families of Children with OCD in Rafsanjan, 2016

Parvin Agha Mohammad Hasani, Mohammadreza Mokhtaree, Mohammad Nazer, Mohammad Reza Mirzaei

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
12 May 2018	11 Apr 2021	17 Jul 2021	10.5812/ijpbs.77176

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 2
2 Revision 1 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 5
3 Revision 2 6
Authors' reply to reviewers 7
Reviewer and editor comments 8
4 Revision 3 Editor-in-Chief 9
Authors' reply to reviewers 10
Reviewer and editor comments 11
5 Revision 4 Reza Bidaki, Editor-in-Chief 12
Authors' reply to reviewers 13
Reviewer and editor comments 14
6 Revision 5 Editor-in-Chief 15
Authors' reply to reviewers 16
Reviewer and editor comments 19

1 Original submission

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

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 ID: 77176

Reviewers' Comments and author's answers:

1- Abstract word count is not appropriate.

Answers: the abstract was corrected. The number of words decreased to less than 250.

2- The name of the study design should be mentioned in the abstract and article body.

Answers: name of the study design mentioned in the abstract and article body. The population of this descriptive study….

3- Abstract should be structured as: background, objective, material/patients and methods, results and conclusion. This structure has not been considered in the abstract exactly. It seems the last sentence of the "background" could move to the "objective".

Answers: Abstract structure corrected.

4- Sample size calculation has not been explained.

All subjects with OCD during 6 months enrolled to study by census method.

5- Validity and reliability of Persian version of questionnaires should be mentioned.

Answers: done.

6- Its not clear for me that Why both of clinical interview and semi structured interview were used in the study?

Answers: method corrected. After clinical interview based on DSM-5 ….

7- Is there any participant with missing data for each variable? This matter has not been indicated in the paper.

Answers: There was no missing data for each variable …

8- References should be mentioned at the end of the sentences in the article body.

Answers: corrected.

9- References are not in accordance with Vancouver style exactly. Journal title abbreviation should be mentioned. Also articles DOI and PMID should be mentioned in this part.

Answers: done.

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

3

Revision 2

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.

1- *"Objective" should be mentioned as a separated part both in the abstract and the body of the manuscript.*
Our answer: Done
2- It seems that the study had cross sectional design so this matter should be mentioned in the method. Also time and place of the study should be mentioned in the title.
Our answer: Done
3- There is some error in English writing should be corrected; for example, the meaning of " informed consist" in the method is not clear.
Our answer: Done
4- Sample size calculation is still unclear. What was the reason you chose the 6-month course to do the study?
Our answer: In the article, does not mention 6 months.
5- In the background mentioned that " In this regard, literature review has demonstrated the lack of presence of any research on determining the heritability of OCD"; while the reference of this information belongs to 9 years ago. I suggest to add more updated data in this area.
Our answer: The sentence was corrected.
6- Please mention the presenting method of descriptive data in the "method" section part both in the abstract and the body of the manuscript.
Our answer: Done
7- Was there any participant with more than one type of obsession?
Our answer: In this study, based on the questionnaire used, there was no participant with more than one type of obsession.
8- Please explain about generalizability of the study results.
Our answer: This sentence was added. "Since this study was conducted in Rafsanjan city, therefore, caution should be exercised in generalizing the results".

3 Revision 2

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

4

Revision 3

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.

Reviewer 1:

The article is good and appropriate.
Just need to changes explanation of sampling method/ and Introduction in discussion

Answer: Done
Reviewer 2:
Dear author/authors
Many thanks for revising the manuscript. I think the necessary revisions have been done, but I think the manuscript needs some other revision as below:
1- Abstract word count should be up to 250. Answer: Done
2- References still needs some edition. Please see the journal instruction. (For example: journal name abbreviation should be mentioned in this part). Also the PMID and DOI of each references should be added. Answer: references edited.
3- English writing still needs to be improved. Answer: English editing was done
My decision: minor revision
Best regards

Reviewer 3:
Thanks for your valuable study
The authors have revised manuscript. But , There are some points and issue , yet.
The grammatical errors are noticeable, yet. Answer: English editing was done.
Some scientific errors are seen. Answer: English editing was done
Exclusion and inclusion criteria aren't acceptable , yet. Answer: Exclusion and inclusion criteria were added.
Please explain about their treatments, shortly.
The authors have focused on genetic role about OCD. But it is important for pay about parenting role. Therefore, you can't result with definitely that it related to family history. It is probable about familial history. Answer: The role of parents and learning in obsessive-compulsive disorder was discussed.
Please displace item 8 to limitations of study. It isn't related to conclusion.
Answer: Done

4 Revision 3

1 comment · 8 Nov 2020

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 8 Nov 2020

Thank you for your recent revisions.
Your paper has now been evaluated again. According to the reviewers' and associate editor's comments, it needs some more revisions. Please make your revisions according to these comments. I would appreciate it if you could make the revisions as soon as possible using the track changes mode in MS Word and colored text.

5

Revision 4

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.

Dear

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Thanks for your attempt for modifying of manuscript

Please renew final conclusion. It seems unsuitable as title and aim.

Our Response: The conclusion was rewritten.

It is better psychiatric disorder and no psychological disorder.
Our Response: Done

It suggest for displacement old references with newer.

Our Response: Done

Regards

5 Revision 4

2 comments · 5 Jan 2021 – 25 Feb 2021

Reza Bidaki Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 5 Jan 2021

Thanks for your efforts to revise the manuscript.
The authors have completed the requested tasks.
It seems suitable for publication after it conforms to the journal's formatting requirements.
The Best

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 25 Feb 2021

Thank you for your recent revisions.
Your paper has now been evaluated again. According to the reviewers' and associate editor's comments, it needs some more revisions. Please make your revisions according to these comments. I would appreciate it if you could make the revisions as soon as possible using the Track Changes mode in MS Word and colored text.

6

Revision 5

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.

Reply to all reviewers' comments (Sep 7, 2018)

Reviewer 3:

1- Abstract word count is not appropriate.

Our answer: Corrected (249 word) (lines: 4-24)
2- The name of the study design should be mentioned in the abstract and article body.

Our answer: Done (lines: 9 and 78)
3- Abstract should be structured as: background, objective, material/patients and methods, results and conclusion. This structure has not been considered in the abstract exactly. It seems the last sentence of the "background" could move to the "objective".

Our answer: Corrected (lines: 4-24)
4- Sample size calculation has not been explained.

Our answer: All subjects enrolled to the study by convenience sampling method in one years (2016)(N=98). (Line: 79)
5- Validity and reliability of Persian version of questionnaires should be mentioned.

Our answer: Done (lines: 92-95)
6- Its not clear for me that Why both of clinical interview and semi structured interview were used in the study?

Our answer: to identify those with actual OCD. Interviews were conducted to confirm the diagnosis, as stated in the article. Also, the questionnaire is a research tool, not a clinical diagnosis tool *(lines: 97-99)*.
7- Is there any participant with missing data for each variable? This matter has not been indicated in the paper.

Our answer: By the end of the study, no one was excluded from the study (Lines: 109).
8- References should be mentioned at the end of the sentences in the article body.

Our answer: Done (Line: 36, 153, 157, 158, 160)
9- References are not in accordance with Vancouver style exactly. Journal title abbreviation should be mentioned. Also articles DOI and PMID should be mentioned in this part.

Our answer: Corrected (Lines: 212-305)

(Aug 3, 2019)

Reviewer 1:
Dear author
Thank you for revising the paper. I think much of the necessary revisions have been done, but, I have some other concerns as below:
1- "Objective" should be mentioned as a separated part both in the abstract and the body of the manuscript.

Our answer: Done (Lines: 7-8; 70-75)

2- It seems that the study had cross sectional design so this matter should be mentioned in the method. Also time and place of the study should be mentioned in the title.

Our answer: Done (Line: 9, 77)
3- There is some error in English writing should be corrected; for example, the meaning of " informed consist" in the method is not clear

. Our answer: corrected (Line: 85)

4- Sample size calculation is still unclear. What was the reason you chose the 6-month course to do the study?

Our answer: Our sampling was done within a year. We assumed that the number of people with obsessive-compulsive disorder in one year was sufficient for the study. (Line: 79)
5- In the background mentioned that " In this regard, literature review has demonstrated the lack of presence of any research on determining the heritability of OCD"; while the reference of this information belongs to 9 years ago. I suggest to add more updated data in this area.

Our answer: The sentence was deleted.
6- Please mention the presenting method of descriptive data in the "method" section part both in the abstract and the body of the manuscript.

Our answer: Done (Line: 14 and 111).
7- Was there any participant with more than one type of obsession?

Our answer: was not observed.
8- Please explain about generalizability of the study results.

Our answer: (line: 202-204)

(Thu, Feb 25)

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Thanks for your attempt because of revision of manuscript
The authors have done requested tasks
It seems suitable for publish after concordance with journal formatting.
The Best
Reviewer 2:
Dear author/authors
Many thanks for revising the manuscript. I think the necessary revisions have been done and the manuscript has potential of publication after revising the references part according to the journal instruction (For example: journal name abbreviation should be mentioned in this part). Also the PMID and DOI of each references should be added.

Our answer: Done (Line: 212 and 305).
My decision: minor revision
Best regards

6 Revision 5

1 comment · 17 Jul 2021

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 17 Jul 2021

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 be finalized only 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.