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.92070
Published in: Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 14(1); e92070

Peer Review Report for "The Effect of a Supportive-Educational Intervention on Maternal-Fetal Attachment of Pregnant Women Facing Domestic Violence: A Randomized Controlled Trial"

Author(s): Zahra Khalili, Maryam Navaee, Mansour Shakiba, Ali Navidian

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	8 Apr 2019
Revised Date:	26 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) 3 Jun 2019

Dear AE,

I `ve reviewed the article entitled" The effect of the educational-supportive intervention on mother-infant attachment of pregnant women under domestic violence centers " and some major concerns have been raised for me which are mentioned below:

1- I think "domestic violence centers" is not the right translation, maybe it is "centers against domestic violence" or something else.

2- In the abstract, it is written that "Cranley's maternal-infant attachment scale" is used for mother-fetus attachment, I think this scale is not an appropriate scale for this reason. In some parts of the article, you mentioned "Cranley's maternal-fetal attachment scale". It is confusing.

3- In the Abstract, it is written about "Hyperemesis Gravidarum (HG)" and the importance of its treatment but the rest of the article is not related to it.

4- according to the guideline of IJPBS,Keywords should be taken from those recommended by the US National Library of Medicine`s Medical Subject Headings(MESH) browser list.

You can use the following address: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/" and they should be ordered according to the alphabet. Some keywords are not selected from MESH
5- Some parts of the results presented in table 2, must be removed from the text.
6- In the method and material section. It is mentioned" A total of 126 eligible individuals were examined, 26 individuals (11 due to not meeting inclusion criteria, 15 due to declining to participate) were excluded. As a result, the study was conducted and followed up on 80 samples (Figure 1) but it is not according to what is presented in figure 1!
7- The manuscript must be completely edited by a native English editor.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 13 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
I would like to appreciate the authors for performing an acceptable study on one of the most important aspects of public mental health and sending the manuscript to IJPBS. I found this manuscript useful, although there are several issues with the sent manuscript which are mentioned below:
1. The title seems to be jargon and should be simplified.
2. Background of the abstract isn`t relevant to the topic and current study and should be revised.
3. 2nd and 4th keywords weren`t selected from MESH and should be replaced.
4. More studies about domestic violence in Iran should be added to introduction.
5. "Validity and reliability of this questionnaire was approved by Abbasi et al. (209) in Iran" should be corrected in the method.
6. In the last line of measurement, it was mentioned " Validity and reliability of the above questionnaire was approved in Iran.". What is the reference to this important sentence?
7. Intervention should be explained in detail.
8. Data in tables should be removed from the text of results.
9. Most important limitation of the current study is the significant difference in education between the two arms and it can explain the significant difference between the two arms after the intervention. It should be highlighted in not only limitations but also results. On the other hand, short time follow-up and small sample size are other limitations of this study.
10. Suggestions for future directions should be added.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 14 Sep 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) 20 Sep 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.
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.

'Response to Reviewers'

Dear Professor

Editor of Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences

I am grateful for a thorough review of our submitted manuscript. This letter provides point-by-point responses to the comments made by the reviewers. I wish to clarify the intent of my statements in the manuscript, and to request re-evaluation of a revised version of the submitted manuscript.

Reviewer # 1

Comment: *1- I think "domestic violence centers" is not right translation, maybe it is "centers against domestic violences" or something else.*

Response: *The word "center" deleted. It was related to the title in proposal.*

Comment: *2- In abstract, it is written that "Cranley's maternal-infant attachment scale" is used for mother-fetus attachment, I think this scale is not appropriate scale for this reason. In some part of article you mentioned to "Cranley's maternal-fetal attachment scale". It is confusing.*

Response: *The statement of "maternal-fetal attachment" replaced in throughout manuscript.*

Comment: *3- In Abstract, it is written about "Hyperemesis Gravidarum (HG)" and the importance of its treatment but the rest of article is not related to it.*

Response: *The unrelated sentence was removed in the introduction of abstract.*

Comment: *4- according to guideline of IJPBS,Keywords should be taken from those recommended by the US National Library of Medicine`s Medical Subject Headings(MESH) browser list. You can use the following address: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/" and they should be ordered according to alphabet. Some keywords are not selected from MESH*

Response: *Keywords were selected from the MESH and they were arranged alphabetically.*

Comment: *5- Some part of results presented as table 2, it must be removed from the text.*

Response: *Some part of results removed from the text and the results section shorted.*

Comment: *6- In method and material section. It is mentioned" A total of 126 eligible individuals were examined, 26 individuals (11 due to not meeting inclusion criteria, 15 due to decline to participate) were excluded. As a result, the study was conducted and followed up on 80 samples (Figure 1) but it is not according to that is presented in figure 1!*

Response: *Descriptions of sample selection were corrected based on 100 participant in flowchart and results section not 80 in descriptions.*

Comment: *7- The manuscript must be completely edited by a native English editor.*

Response: *The manuscript was edited as much as possible.*

Reviewer # 2

Comment: *1. The title seems to be jargon and should be simplified.*

Response: *The title was edited and simplified.*

Comment: *2. Background of abstract isn`t relevant to topic and current study and should be revised.*

Response: *The unrelated sentence was removed in the introduction of abstract.*

Comment: *3. 2nd and 4th key words weren`t selected from MESH and should be replaced.*

Response: *Keywords were selected from the MESH and they were arranged alphabetically.*

Comment: *4. More studies about domestic violence in Iran should be added to introduction.*

Response: *Yes, there are many studies on violence against women, but the subject of manuscript is the violence in pregnancy and intervention to increase maternal-fetal attachment. It has been summarized to prevent the unnecessary increase in the number of references.*

Comment: *5. "Validity and reliability of this questionnaire was approved by Abbasi et al. (209) in Iran" should be corrected in method.*

Response: *The validity and reliability of the instruments used were corrected along with the relevant references.*

Comment: *6. in last line of measurement, it was mentioned "Validity and reliability of the above questionnaire was approved in Iran.". What is the reference of this important sentence?*

Response: *The validity and reliability of the instruments used were corrected along with the relevant references.*

Comment: *7. Intervention should be explained in details.*

Response: *The intervention described in the methodology completely.*

Comment: *8. Data in tables should be removed from text of results.*

Response: *Some part of results removed from the text and the results section shorted.*

Comment: *9. Most important limitation of current study is significant difference of education between two arms and it can explain significant different of two arms after intervention. It should be highlighted in not only limitations but also results. On the other hand, short time follow-up and small sample size are other limitations of this study.*

Response: *Significant difference of education between two groups, short time follow-up and small sample size mentioned as limitations. Significant difference of education between two groups explained in results section.*

Comment: *10. Suggestions for future directions should be added.*

Response: *Suggestions for future studies mentioned.*

Best Regards,

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) 19 Dec 2019

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 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.