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.86230
Published in: Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 14(2); e86230

Peer Review Report for "High Rate of Psychopathology in Parents of Children with Epilepsy"

Author(s): Shahrokh Amiri, Sara Farhang, Arash Mohagheghi, Nahideh Abdi, Meygol Taghibeigi, Mehran Aghamohammadpour, Salman Safikhanlou, Salman Abdi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 11 Nov 2018
Revised Date: 1 Dec 2019
Accepted Date: 10 May 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) 15 Feb 2019

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
The manuscript reports a high rate of psychiatric disorders in parents of epileptic children in Iran. The novelty of the investigation is the region studied and the details of methods and results could be considered as having some degrees of novelty as well. Findings could be of use for clinicians dealing with epileptic children as “Clinicians should consider both neurological and psychosocial factors, including the family system, when treating psychopathology in children with epilepsy.” 1
However, the following considerations are suggested:
• The language of the manuscript is acceptably fluent; however minor errors exist including omission of several distances between words thereupon the paper could be improved by slight editing.
• Clinical impact of the findings could be mentioned.
• Previous investigations in Iran include reports of general health questionnaires as well as Health-Related Quality of Life which could be mentioned and used in the discussion.2-5
Sincerely
References

1. Rodenburg R, Stams GJ, Meijer AM, Aldenkamp AP, Deković M. Psychopathology in children with epilepsy: a meta-analysis. Journal of pediatric psychology 2005; 30: 453-68.
2. Mehdi K, Mahboobe S, Zeinab P, Zahra A, Farzane K, Safollah A, et al. Mental health and coping styles in families of epileptic patients in Iran. The Social Sciences 2012; 7: 130-3.
3. Momeni M, Ghanbari A, Bidabadi E, Yousefzadeh-Chabok S. Health-related quality of life and related factors in children and adolescents with epilepsy in Iran. Journal of Neuroscience Nursing 2015; 47: 340-5.
4. Nematpour S, Behrouzian F. Parental knowledge and general health in parents of children with epilepsy. 2010.
5. Zamani G, Shiva S, Mohammadi M, Gharaie JM, Rezaei N. A survey of quality of life in adolescents with epilepsy in Iran. Epilepsy & Behavior 2014; 33: 69-72.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 16 Aug 2019

Dear EIC,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
- In the abstract, the aim and the purpose of the study weren't included.
- The results look weird and the figures are over-expected. In my opinion, it was better to discuss more confounding factors such as the effect of chronic disorders on parental mental health or differences in demographic variables, for example, most of the participants were from rural areas compared to the control group.
- The limitations were not complete.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 23 Aug 2019

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.

Dear Associate Editor

Thanking for your coordination, we revised the manuscript based on valuable comments of reviewers and yours. We believe we could address all of them as follows:

Reviewer 1:

1. Language editing is performed.
2. We already stated that interventions targeting psychiatric disorders in parents will have clinical benefits. We added few more sentences to make it more noticeable.
3. We cited (suitable) studies suggested by the reviews.

Associate Editor's Comments:

4. In the abstract, aim of the study is provided.
5. You have stated that "the figures are over-expected" that might be confusion, as we don't have figures.
6. Chronic disorders (other than epilepsy) were not assessed in children or parents, we added this to limitations. As well as differences in demographic variables. We also added analysis about difference of the two groups in term of demographic factors to result section.
7. Limitations section is improved.

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) 9 Nov 2019

Dear EIC,
Many of the issues raised by the first referee were corrected. There were problems with the report of the symptoms that I mentioned in the attachment.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 9 Nov 2019

Dear Author,
Thank you for your recent revisions.
Your paper has now been evaluated again. According to the associate editor's comments it needs some more revisions. Please do your revisions according to these comments. I appreciate you doing 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.

Dear Editor

First, we thank for your effort in the review process. Esteemed reviewers have put two comments on the manuscript file, that we give answer to them in order of appearance:

1. There are not tow numbers for borderline and depression, first sentences are for children with epilepsy and second part is for controls. We highlighted them to be clearer.
2. The second comments, was marked as “?”, and the sentence is now rephrased.

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) — 14 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
This is a very interesting and well written manuscript.
It's a relatively new topic for research. Presented study is widening our knowledge of the role of child's epilepsy on parents.
It would be interesting to repeat such type of studies in future.
Readable language, adequate conclusions, well-selected literature.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) — 17 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for considering the related comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) — 19 Apr 2020

Dear EIC,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1- The format of the abstract should be based on the format of the journal.
2- The keywords should be ordered alphabetically.
3- The newly added sections require English editing.
In general, it is ready to be published.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) — 10 May 2020

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.