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

Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijpbs.84188
Published in: Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 14(1); e84188

Peer Review Report for "Relationship Between Oxidative Stress Concentration and Postpartum Depression: A Cohort Study"

Author(s): Seideh Hanieh Alamolhoda , Nourossadat Kariman, Parvaneh Mirabi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 11 Sep 2018
Revised Date: 24 Sep 2019
Accepted Date: 11 Jan 2020

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)

6 Oct 2018

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1. Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported.
2. State-specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses.
3. Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up.
4. You mentioned" The number of samples was estimated as 61 people considering previous studies" please add a reference.
5. Explain how missing data were addressed.
6. If applicable, explain how the loss to follow-up was addressed
7. In Result section: Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—e.g. numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible and included in the study.
8. Give reasons for non-participation at each stage.
9. Consider use of a flow diagram.
10. completing follow-up, and analyzed
11. Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations,

multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence.
12. Summarize key results with reference to study objectives.
13. Please modify references according to the journal style.
14. Your manuscript needs some editing to correct English grammatical mistakes.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 22 Oct 2018

Dear AE,
The manuscript entitle "Relationship between stress oxidative concentration and postpartum depression" has been reviewed. The aim of the study is relative interest but there are some problems that should be resolved and it is not recommended for publication in this format.
1. In the title section, "stress oxidative concentration "must be replaced with "oxidative stress concentration"
2. The whole manuscript suffers from both grammar and typological errors. Hence, the manuscript should be revised by a native English person or an official company.
3. The rationale of the study is not clear, so it should be rewritten. In the introduction section, the authors mostly focused on the prevalence of PPD (postpartum depression) and also an important role of oxidative stress. But it must to explain the relationship between PPD and Oxidative stress and the possible controversial studies. So the introduction section must be rewritten.
4. In addition, in the introduction section the authors mentioned that :
Few studies have been conducted on oxidative stress in depressive disorder and the results are contradictory (17).
But however, In the ref.17, the authors concluded that :
These findings are in accordance with the hypothesis that oxidative stress may play an important role in the pathogenesis of depression
So it seems that the ref.17 is not in an appreciated position. In another hand, there is a large body of evidence that shows the strong relationship between oxidative stress and depression. See the link:
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0278584613002121#f0005
5. In the material and methods section, paragraph 2, about sample size, If they have any references, they should cite them in the text.
6. A graph is needed to show the main results (instead of Table3,4,5). The legends of the tables/graphs are missed. The abbreviations should also be defined in the text and Tables/graphs, such as SAPS, SANS, etc.
7. The discussion section is too cursory, they must rewrite this section. However, the findings can be interpreted and discussed better. The interpretations should be in line with the goals and rationale of the study.
8. The conclusion(s) of the study is not well-written and should be revised.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 17 Jan 2019

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.

Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 19 Jan 2019

Dear Authors,
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.
Also please add the "Ethical Committee" approval code.
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
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.

84188

Relationship between stress oxidative concentration and postpartum depression

Dear Editor

We greatly appreciate the reviewers and editors for their complimentary comments and suggestions. We have carried out the comments that the reviewers suggested and revised the manuscript accordingly. Below find attached a point-by-point response to reviewer's concerns. We hope that you find our responses satisfactory.

Response to the comments on the article that the dear reviewers noted:

Reviewers' comments:

1-Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported.
Answer: Oxidative stress occurs when production of oxidative reactive substances exceeds the cellular antioxidant defense capacity for excretion of oxidative toxins. There is evidence that oxidative stress plays a role in more than 100 diseases including cancer, neurodegenerative diseases and most of psychiatric problems. Oxidative stress can lead to lipid per oxidation. Malondialdehyde (MDA) is a final product of lipid per oxidation and one of the most common factors for checking the status of oxidative stress. Few studies have been conducted on oxidative stress in depressive disorder and the results are contradictory

2- State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses.
Answer: The primary objective of the study was to determine the relationship between oxidative stress and postpartum depression.
We hypothesized that higher level of oxidative stress is associated with depressive disorder.

3-Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up.
Answer: We added the following statement:

All the women who participated in this study had these criteria; they were Iranian, literate, singleton pregnant, gestational age of 38-40 weeks, maternal age of 18-40 years old, vaginal delivery or uncomplicated cesarean section

Exclusion criteria in this study included history of depression during previous pregnancy or during the life, history of infertility, suffering from chronic or acute diseases before or after delivery, vegetarian diets and recent nervous tension such as death of loved ones.

4-You mentioned" The number of samples was estimated as 61 people considering previous studies" please add a reference.
Answer: Based on reviewers ‘comment it was added.

5- Explain how missing data were addressed.
Answer: 24 women had missing data (6 subjects excluded because of missing oxidative stress measurement and 18 women because of incomplete questionnaire).

6-if applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed
Answer: we explained in manuscript.
A total of 123 pregnant women were recruited. Among them 23 pregnant women not meeting inclusion criteria, 12 declined to participate and 8 participants for other reasons excluded from this trial. After these exclusions, Finally 80 pregnant women remained for the analysis (Fig1).

7-In Result section: Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—e.g. numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible and included in the study.
Answer: We added the following statement in the result section.
A total of 113women, were recruited in this study, while 33 of them were excluded: 24 women had missing data (6 subjects excluded because of missing oxidative stress measurement and 18 women because of incomplete questionnaire) and 9 women Declined to participate. Finally, 80 participants were involved in the further analysis.

8-Give reasons for non-participation at each stage.
Answer: Based on review s comment it was added.

9-Consider use of a flow diagram.
Answer: According to review s comment flow diagram was added.

11-Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence.
Answer: we have done so.

12-Summarize key results with reference to study objectives.
Answer: Our results showed that oxidative stress play an important role in pathogenesis of postpartum depression and suggest the importance of antioxidants use in diet among high-risk pregnant women. Nevertheless, further studies are necessary to confirm the physiological relevance of these results.

13-Please modify references according to the journal style.
Answer: we have modified accordingly.

14- Your manuscript needs some editing to correct English grammatical mistakes.
Answer: Our manuscript has been reviewed and revised to improve readability.

***Reviewer** 2*
1-In title section, "stress oxidative concentration "must be replace with "oxidative stress concentration"
Answer: According to review s comment it was changed.

2-he whole manuscript suffers from both grammar and typological errors. Hence, the manuscript should be revised by a native English person or an official company.
Answer: Our manuscript has been reviewed and revised to improve readability.

3-The rationale of the study is not clear, so it should be rewritten. In the introduction section, the authors mostly focused on the prevalence of PPD (postpartum depression) and also important role of oxidative stress. But it must to explain the relationship of PPD and Oxidative stress and the possible controversial studies. So the introduction section must be rewritten.
Answer: it was changed.

4-In addition, in the introduction section the authors mentioned that:
Few studies have been conducted on oxidative stress in depressive disorder and the results are of
Answer: We apologize for the errors. They have been corrected in the revised manuscript.

5-In the material and methods section, paragraph 2, about sample size, if they have any reference, they should cite in the text.
Answer: According to your suggestion, it was added.

7. The discussion section is too cursory, they must be rewrite this section. However, the findings can be interpreted and discussed better. The interpretations should be in line with the goals and rationale of the study.
Answer: we have done

8. The conclusion(s) of the study is not well-written and should be revised.

Answer: Based on reviewers' comments comment it was added ***Answer:*** We thank the reviewer for this good suggestion, in the revised paper it was omitted.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Also please add the "Ethical Committee" approval code.

Answer: This protocol was approved by the ethical committee of Shahid Beheshti University, School of Nursing and Midwifery (IR.SBMU.1390.98).

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: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 16 Mar 2019

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 10 May 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks for revising the paper. Some of the necessary revisions have been done, but I think the paper needs some other revisions as below:
1- Study design should be mentioned in the title.
2- Abstract should be structured as background, objective, material/patients and methods, results, and conclusion. This structure has not been considered in the abstract. Also "objective" should be included in the article body as a separated part.
3- Time and place of the study, statistical tests should be mentioned in the abstract.
4- Some keywords are not selected from MESH.
5- I suggest describing the rationale of the study with more details (for example previous studies carried out and their limitations and the knowledge gap that exists in this area) and removing some unnecessary details from the first part of the "introduction".
6- Tables count is high. I suggest integrating some of the first tables.
7- References need some editions;. Journal name abbreviations should be mentioned in references. Please mention the PMID and DOI of the articles in the references part.
8- English writing should be improved.
My decision: revision
Best regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 10 May 2019

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,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (1)** 10 May 2019

Dear Authors,

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 do your revisions according to these 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.

Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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.

Journal: Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Manuscript ID: 84188
Title: Relationship between oxidative stress concentration and postpartum depression
Revision: [2]

Dear Editor

We greatly appreciate the reviewers and editors for their complimentary comments and suggestions. We have carried out the comments that the reviewers suggested and revised the manuscript accordingly. Below find attached a point-by-point response to reviewer's concerns. We hope that you find our responses satisfactory.

Reviewers' comments:

1- Study design should be mentioned in the title.
Answer: we have done so.

2- Abstract should be structured as: background, objective, material/patients and methods, results and conclusion. This structure has not been considered in the abstract. Also "objective" should be included in the article body as a separated part.
Answer: we have modified accordingly.

3- Time and place of the study, statistical tests should be mentioned in the abstract.
Answer: Based on reviewer's suggestion it was added.

4- Some key words are not selected from MESH.
Answer: Based on reviewer's comment it was changed.

5- I suggest to describe rationale of the study with more details (for example previous studies carried out and their limitations and the knowledge gap exist in this area) and remove some unnecessary details from the first part of the "introduction".
Answer: We added the following statement:
The literature examining potential relationship between oxidative stress during pregnancy and postpartum depression remains limited. To our knowledge, researchers only focused on depression among non-pregnant women or evaluating associations between postnatal dietary patterns and postpartum mental health status. However, the data from clinical studies, are not so unequivocal

6- Tables count is high. I suggest to integrate some of the first tables.
Answer: As suggested by the reviewer, in the revised paper it was omitted.

7- References need some editions; Journal name abbreviations should be mentioned in references. Please mention PMID and DOI of the articles in the references part.

Answer: They have been corrected in the revised manuscript.

8- English writing should be improved.

Answer: Our manuscript has been reviewed by (Dr. Evangeline Foronda) and revised to improve readability.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) — 8 Jun 2019

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) — 23 Jul 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks for revising the paper. I think much of the necessary revisions have been done, but, I have some other concerns as below:
1- Abstract word count is not appropriate. I suggest to write "background" more precisely.
2- The results reported in the abstract are not compatible with the manuscript text.
3- In the references part journals name abbreviation should be mentioned.
My decision: minor revision
Best regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) — 23 Jul 2019

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,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) — 24 Jul 2019

Dear Authors,
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 do your revisions according to these 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.
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 (3)

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.

84188

Relationship between stress oxidative concentration and postpartum depression

Dear Editor

We greatly appreciate the reviewers and editors for their complimentary comments and suggestions. We have carried out the comments that the reviewers suggested and revised the manuscript accordingly. Below find attached a point-by-point response to reviewer's concerns.

Reviewer 1:
Accept

Reviewer 2:

1-Abstract word count is not appropriate. I suggest to write "background" more precisely.

- Thanks for your comment. we have modified accordingly

2- *The results reported in the abstract are not compatible with the manuscript text.*

- Thanks for your attention, we noted brief results in abstract and wrote prevalence of post- partum blue and depression and considered result details in context.

3- *In the references part journals name abbreviation should be mentioned.*

- Thank you for your recommendation. We use EndNote and the journal style (Vancouver).

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (3) 16 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (3) 22 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
Thank you for revising the paper. Some of the necessary revisions have been done, but, I think the paper needs some other revisions as below (some of the comments were also mentioned previously):
1- The time and place of the study and statistical tests should be mentioned in the abstract.
2- Conclusion seems to be removed from the abstract.
3- There are two series of keywords in the manuscript. Which one is acceptable for you?
4- According to the journal instruction, journals name abbreviation should be mentioned in the references part.
Best regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (3) 22 Sep 2019

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,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (3) 23 Sep 2019

Dear Authors,
Thank you for your recent revisions.
Your paper has now been evaluated again. Unfortunately, you have not done all of the requested revisions, nor have you responded to all of the reviewers' comments. Please do your revisions according to the mentioned 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.

Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (4)

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.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
با سلام
به نظر اصلاحات انجام شده است

Reviewer 2:
Dear author
Thank you for revising the paper. Some of the necessary revisions have been done, but, I think the paper needs some other revisions as below (some of the comments were also mentioned previously):
1- Time and place of the study and statistical tests should be mentioned in the abstract.

Answer: Based on reviewer's suggestion it was added.

)Materials Patients and Methods: This prospective cohort study conducted in the health centers affiliated to Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences from January up May 2017 (
2- Conclusion seems to be removed from the abstract.

Based on your comment it was revised.

Conclusion: The present study demonstrated a relationship between serum total antioxidant capacity concentration and postpartum depression

3- There are two series of keywords in the manuscript. Which one is acceptable for you?

Oxidative stress, Malondialdehyde, Postpartum depression

4- According to the journal instruction, journals name abbreviation should be mentioned in the references part.
My decision: minor revision
Best regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (4)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (4) 25 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks for revising the paper. I think necessary revisions have been done and the manuscript could be published in the journal.
Best regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (4) 25 Dec 2019

Dear EIC,
Many thanks for revising " Relationship between oxidative stress concentration and postpartum depression: a cohort study ". I received comments from reviewers who believed that necessary revisions have been done, so I think the manuscript could be published in the Iranian journal of psychiatry and behavioral sciences.
sincerely yours

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (4) 11 Jan 2020

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