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.97456
Published in: Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 14(4); e97456

Peer Review Report for "Prevalence and Factors Associated with Physical Punishment and Psychological Aggression Towards Children in Laos: Results of the 2017 Social Indicator Survey"

Author(s): Supa Pengpid, Karl Peltzer

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 1 Sep 2019
Revised Date: 3 Aug 2020
Accepted Date: 21 Aug 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) — 31 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
It's a good article on an important topic. Please see my comments in the attached file.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 31 Jul 2020

Dear EIC,
This is with further reference to the paper submitted for possible publication in IJPBS.
The 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.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 31 Jul 2020

Dear Author,

Your paper has been evaluated by external peer reviewer. Please do your revisions according to the reviewer's 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 reviewer's 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.

PEER REVIEW FORM

Manuscript ID: 97456

Date: 8/1/2020

Total Score: (min: 0, max: 20)

Title

1) Proper Article TITLE? 20
2) Does the title reflect the content appropriately? 20
3) Is there any abbreviation in the TITLE? No
4) Importance and originality or the subject? (Is the information, or the interpretation of the information, new?) 10
5) Proper Authors' names and institutional affiliations? The review is blind.
6) Source(s) of support in the form of grants, equipment, drugs, or all of these? The review is blind.

Abstract

7) Is there structured ABSTRACT? Yes. But the abstract must use the following headings: Backgroun, Objectives, Methods, Results, and Conclusion.
   Response: Corrected
8) How many words are there in the ABSTRACT (Count = 250-350)? 267
9) Accurateness and adequacy of the ABSTRACT? (Does the abstract describe the content accurately?) Yes-18
10) Are KEYWORDS (3-10) selected form MESH (http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/MBrowser.html)? No
    Response: Corrected

Introduction

11) Clarity of the objectives/hypotheses? (Are the objectives clearly stated?) Yes 18
12) Does INTRODUCTION include: "What we know", "What we don't know" and "Aims"? Yes 16

Materials And Methods

13) Clearly describe selection of participants (patients or laboratory animals, including controls)? No. Describe sampling method.
    Response: below is added
    The urban and rural areas within each province were identified as the main sampling strata and the sample of households was selected in two stages." (14) "Within each stratum, a specified number of census enumeration areas were selected systematically with probability proportional to size. After a household listing was carried out within the selected enumeration areas, a systematic sample of 20 households was drawn from each sample enumeration area."(14) The child discipline module was implemented in all households with at least one child between 1-14 years. If the household had more than one child between 1-14 years old, one child was randomly selected using the Kish method (14).

14) Study Design Described Sufficiently? Yes. 16
15) Adequacy of the sample studied? Describe sample size calculation method

16) Subjects Representative of Target Population? Describe sampling method.

17) Provided sample size calculation or justification? No.
18) Power of study declared? No.
19) Reported actual P values for primary analyses? Yes.
20) Identify the methods, apparatus (give the manufacturer's name and address in parentheses)? Describe psychometric properties of the measures.
Response: below is added
The reliability of scores from the PCCTS was 0.71 in the current study.
21) Identify procedures in sufficient detail to allow other workers to reproduce the results? No.

Response: more is added, as below

Within each stratum, a specified number of census enumeration areas were selected systematically with probability proportional to size. After a household listing was carried out within the selected enumeration areas, a systematic sample of 20 households was drawn from each sample enumeration area."(14) The child discipline module was implemented in all households with at least one child between 1-14 years. If the household had more than one child between 1-14 years old, one child was randomly selected using the Kish method (14).

22) Give references to established methods and brief descriptions for methods that have been published but are not well known? No.
23) Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria Explained? No.
Response: below is added
The child discipline module was implemented in all households with at least one child between 1-14 years. If the household had more than one child between 1-14 years old, one child was randomly selected using the Kish method (14).

24) Appropriate Statistical Analysis? Yes.
25) Identified all statistical methods unambiguously? Yes.
26) Explain Ethical Considerations? Please add the "Ethical Committee" approval code.
Response: There is no approval code

Results

27) Accuracy of the interpretation of RESULTS? Yes.
28) RESULTS recorded appropriately? Yes.
29) Appropriateness, clarity, and adequacy of the TABLES AND FIGURES? Yes.
30) Present results in logical sequence in the text, tables, and illustrations, giving the main or most important findings? Yes.
31) Repeat the data in the tables and Text? No.
32) Emphasize or summarize only important observations? Yes.
33) Any Appendix for extra or supplementary materials and technical detail? No.
34) Restrict tables and figures to those needed to explain the argument of the paper and to assess its support? Yes.
35) Use graphs as an alternative to tables with many entries? No.
36) Duplicate data in graphs and tables? No.

37) Use technical terms as non-technical in statistics, such as “random” (which implies a randomizing device), “normal,” “significant,” “correlations,” and “sample.”? No.

Discussion

38) Relevance of the DISCUSSION section? Yes.
39) CONCLUSIONS justified & substantiated? Yes.
40) Analysis supports CONCLUSIONS? Yes.
41) Are the conclusions supported by the discussion? Yes.

References

42) Appropriateness of the REFERENCES? Yes.
43) Proper Writing of the REFERENCES? Please revise the references according to the guidelines of the journal. Please use abbreviated name of the journals according to MEDLINE database. You also may find abbreviations on the Wikipedia website. If it is needed to reference a journal article written by more than six authors, should be listed six authors names followed by "et al ". This matter has not been considered in this manuscript.

Response: Corrected

44) References for the last 5 years? Yes.
45) Which type of writing is observed for references (Vancouver, Harward, Oxford, etc)? Vancouver
46) Indicate references in parentheses? No.

Response: Corrected

General Review

47) Proper Style for Medical Writing? Good.
48) Define unique terms and acronyms the first time used?
49) Proper English Grammar and Writing? Good.
50) Which sections are too long? No one.
51) Which sections are too short? Methods.

Response: more is added

52) Which sections of this manuscript could be misunderstood? No one.
53) Your Final Conclusion is: Approve, Minor Revision, Major Revision, Decline: Minor Revision

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) 21 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
The revised version of the manuscript is acceptable and may be considered for publication in the Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 21 Aug 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** (1) 21 Aug 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.