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.86477
Published in: Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 14(2); e86477

Peer Review Report for "Resilience, Emotions, and Character Strengths as Predictors of Job Stress in Military Personnel"

Author(s): Arsia Taghva, Seyed Teymur Seyedi Asl, Amir Mohsen Rahnejat , Mohammad Mehdi Elikaee

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 24 Nov 2018
Revised Date: 12 Apr 2020
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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 1 Mar 2019

Dear EIC,
The authors should see the attached reviewers' comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 1 Mar 2019

Dear Author,
Your paper has been evaluated by external peer reviewers. Please do your revisions according to the reviewers' comments. I appreciate you doing 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.

Dr. Mehran Zarghami

Editor-in-Chief

Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences (IJPBS)

April 4, 2020

We appreciate your fast revision of our manuscript. Your comments were received and corrections were made accordingly and highlighted.

Comment 1: “Objective” should be a separate subtitle.

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 1.

Objectives:

Comment 2: “cross sectional” is a better term.

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 1.

cross sectional

Comment 3: You should describe the procedure. How did you call them? Where did you do the procedure? Did they fill the questioners themselves? Were the questioners blind?

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 3.

The procedure of data collection was as follows: At first, the questionnaires were distributed to the military personnel who were willing to fill in the questionnaires. For this purpose, various military centers were visited in Tehran. In the second phase, two weeks later researchers again visited the same military centers and received complete questionnaires. Finally the collected questionnaires were coded and entered into statistical software.

Comment 4: “cross sectional” is a better term.

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 3.

cross sectional

Comment 5: How did you assess the mental illness?

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 3.

according to self-declaration.

Comment 6: Is this a part of HES?

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 4.

Stress Questionnaire

Comment 7: What is the original reference of “Health and Safety Executive (HSE) Stress Questionnaire”?

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 4.

(31).

Comment 8: scale

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 4.

Scale

Comment 9: scale

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 4.

Scale

Comment 10: Please mention “the Persian Version” of the scale (or measure or instrument)

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 4.

Persian Version of this questionnaire has a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.73 to 0.91 (36,37).

Comment 11: name of questionnaire

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 4.

Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS): This is a self-report questionnaire that widely used to measure positive and negative emotions.

Comment 12: Male?

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 5.

Male

Comment 13: “conclusion” should be a subtitle of “Doscussion”.

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 6.

Conclusion

Comment 14: What is the meaning of “psychological issues”? Positive and negative emotions are psychological issues themselves.

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 6.

more severe psychological problems.

Comment 15: This contrasts with your statement regarding the validity of the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) Stress Questionnaire.

Answer: this part deleted from article in page 7

Comment 16: Use capital letters for the abbreviation (AJA).

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 7.

AJA University of Medical Science.

Comment 17: Please add the information. Funding/support:

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 7.

Funding/support: The present study was funded by the Research Department of AJA University of Medical Science.

Comment 18: Please add. Ethical committee code:

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 7.

Ethical committee code: The study was approved by the University Research Council on September 11, 2017 number IR.AJAUMS.REC.1398.262.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

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) 9 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
The major problem of the current research is its sampling method. Convenient sampling leads to bias in the findings. The appropriate sampling method is “stratified sampling”. I suggest mentioning this problem as the major limitation of the study at the end of the manuscript.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 9 Apr 2020

Dear EIC,
Thanks for the recent revisions.
The paper has now been evaluated again by the external peer reviewers. Unfortunately, the authors have not done all of the requested revisions. Please do your revisions according to the mentioned comments. I appreciate them doing the revisions as soon as possible by using the track changes mode in MS Word and using colored text.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 9 Apr 2020

Dear Author,
As you will see, although the referees find some merit in the paper, some revisions are required before we can consider it further. Consequently, I invite you to submit a revised manuscript in due course.
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.

Dr. Mehran Zarghami

Editor-in-Chief

Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences (IJPBS)

April 11, 2020

We appreciate your fast revision of our manuscript. Your comments were received and corrections were made accordingly and highlighted.

Comment 1: “Objective” should be a separate subtitle.

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 1.

Objectives:

Comment 2: “cross sectional” is a better term.

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 1.

cross sectional

Comment 3: You should describe the procedure. How did you call them? Where did you do the procedure? Did they fill the questioners themselves? Were the questioners blind?

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 3.

The procedure of data collection was as follows: At first, the questionnaires were distributed to the military personnel who were willing to fill in the questionnaires. For this purpose, various military centers were visited in Tehran. In the second phase, two weeks later researchers again visited the same military centers and received complete questionnaires. Finally the collected questionnaires were coded and entered into statistical software.

Comment 4: “cross sectional” is a better term.

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 3.

cross sectional

Comment 5: How did you assess the mental illness?

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 3.

according to self-declaration.

Comment 6: Is this a part of HES?

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 4.

Stress Questionnaire

Comment 7: What is the original reference of “Health and Safety Executive (HSE) Stress Questionnaire”?

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 4.

(31).

Comment 8: scale

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 4.

Scale

Comment 9: scale

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 4.

Scale

Comment 10: Please mention “the Persian Version” of the scale (or measure or instrument)

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 4.

Persian Version of this questionnaire has a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.73 to 0.91 (36,37).

Comment 11: name of questionnaire

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 4.

Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS): This is a self-report questionnaire that widely used to measure positive and negative emotions.

Comment 12: Male?

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 5.

Male

Comment 13: “conclusion” should be a subtitle of “Doscussion”.

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 6.

Conclusion

Comment 14: What is the meaning of “psychological issues”? Positive and negative emotions are psychological issues themselves.

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 6.

more severe psychological problems.

Comment 15: This contrasts with your statement regarding the validity of the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) Stress Questionnaire.

Answer: this part deleted from article in page 7

Comment 16: Use capital letters for the abbreviation (AJA).

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 7.

AJA University of Medical Science.

Comment 17: Please add the information. Funding/support:

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 7.

Funding/support: The present study was funded by the Research Department of AJA University of Medical Science.

Comment 18: Please add. Ethical committee code:

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 7.

Ethical committee code: The study was approved by the University Research Council on September 11, 2017 number IR.AJAUMS.REC.1398.262.

Comment 19: The major problem of the current research is its sampling method. Convenient sampling leads to bias in the findings. The appropriate sampling method is “stratified sampling”. I suggest to mention this problem as the major limitation of the study at the end of the manuscript.

Answer: Corrected and highlighted in page 7.

Moreover, the major limitation of the study was sampling method. Convenient sampling leads to bias in the findings.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

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) 10 May 2020

Dear AE
The revised version of the manuscript is acceptable.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 10 May 2020

Dear EIC,
It is a pleasure to accept this manuscript in its current form for publication in Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences (IJPBS).
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.