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.89168
Published in: Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 14(2); e89168

Peer Review Report for "Effectiveness of a Snoezelen Room on Fear, Anxiety, and Satisfaction of Nulliparous Women: A Randomized Controlled Trial"

Author(s): Mariyam Momeni, Mansoureh Jamshidimanesh, Hadi Ranjbar

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	20 Feb 2019
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) — 7 Mar 2020

Dear EIC,
This is with further reference to this paper submitted for possible publication in IJPBS.
This paper has been carefully reviewed and it is suggested that the manuscript requires considerable revision and should be modified according to the reviewers' comments which are appended below.
If the authors can satisfactorily reply to all the points raised by the reviewers, we would be pleased to consider a revised manuscript for further review. With your revised version, kindly upload an annotated list addressing each of the reviewers' comments and highlighting where changes have been made to the manuscript. This will facilitate and accelerate our assessment of the revised paper.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 7 Mar 2020

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 (including references and title page) should not be more than 3500 words. Original articles' maximum number of references is 55, maximum Number of illustrations/Tables is 5. Otherwise, you should pay extra charge to the publisher.

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 Reviewer,

1-Word of snoezelen was corrected in title.

2- According to consort reporting 2010 and an article with title “E6 (R2) Good Clinical Practice: Integrated Addendum to ICH E6 (R1) Guidance for Industry”. Blinding only prevent information bias. Also with referring to a systematic review and meta-analysis “Acupuncture for pain relief in labour”, primary studies were mentioned RCT in there. If you permit title be same RCT.

3- The study tool was expressed in method of abstract part 15 to 17 line.

4- We tried to change The introduction for support the hypothesis of the paper. And why would use snoezelen on nulliparous woman.
5- Fear and anxiety defined in introduction, 31 to 38 lines.
6- Our research innovation and gap of studies expressed in text.
7- 130 women were corrected and Akbar Abady stated as name of research field in materials and methods 104 and 105 line.
8- It was explain more in Procedures part 131 to 136 lines.
9- Table of numbers was corrected in results of part.
10- Diagram of consort for two groups from women was corrected.
11- The discussion was corrected.
12- Limitation of study was corrected 266 line.
13- Table 1 was corrected.

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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 23 Mar 2020

Dear Authors,
The revisions are acceptable, but the English of the paper needs improvement in grammar and structure, some polishment and careful proofreading before publication. Possibly, a native-speaker review would help on this.
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.

I apologize, the table numbers were moved in paragraphs.

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 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.