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.98256
Published in: Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 14(2); e98256

Peer Review Report for "The Effect of Writing Therapy on Anxiety in Pregnant Women: A Randomized Controlled Trial"

Author(s): Maryam Montazeri, Khalil Esmaeilpour, Sakineh Mohammad-Alizadeh-Charandabi, Sevda Golizadeh, Mojgan Mirghafourvand

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	21 Sep 2019
Revised Date:	15 Mar 2020
Accepted Date:	3 Apr 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)

6 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1. Page one, findings the last line, please correct the p-value number, it doesn't match with Table 2 content.
2. page three, first paragraph, references 22 to 28, are you sure all of this therapies have assessed in pregnant women? Please check this references again.
3. Page three, methods and materials section, second paragraph, line 1 and 2, please report the number of first or second pregnancies in both groups, in result section, as we will comment in Table 2.
4. Page four, sampling section, first line, how many of this centers entered in your study? And in what basis? What do you mean: crowded (how many population?) and various? Please make available exact information.
5. Page five, paragraph one, and line four, socio-demographic by participants? It is unusual.
6. Page six, first line, these groups were in which sizes, 3 or 5 or ... mothers in each group?
7. Page six, data collection tools section, line second, and were completed through interview? Completed by who? Mothers themselves? There is some ambiguous, this scale is a self-report inventory.

8. Page seven, results section, paragraph one, these numbers don't match with Fig.1 Please, check them again.
9. page ten, paragraph one, as I found out, 2 researcher were involved in the sampling, not the other staff, for privacy of participants.
10. Page twelve, references section, please, check your citations and references again, for example 22, 23.
11. Page eighteen, table 2, comments in uploaded PDF.
12. Page twenty, figure one, comments in uploaded PDF.
Thanks.

arash rezaei shahmirzadi: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 8 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
The study is appropriate and up-to-date, but it is better to make the required changes.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 5 Mar 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) 5 Mar 2020

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 (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.

Prof. Mehran Zarghami

Editor-in-Chief, Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences (IJPBS)

Dear Prof. Mehran Zarghami

Please find the revised manuscript entitled "**The Effect of Writing Therapy on Anxiety in Pregnant Women: A Randomized Controlled Trial**". We have carefully considered the reviewers' comments and have addressed them in the following attachment. We hope that the revisions in the manuscript and our accompanying responses will be sufficient to make our manuscript suitable for publication in the Journal. We look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

Response to reviewers

We thank you for their highly insightful comments which have enabled us to greatly improve the quality of our manuscript. In the following are our point-by-point responses to each of the comments.

(Reviewer 1):

-Page one, findings last line, please correct the p-value number, it doesn't match with Table 2 content.

We have corrected the P-value.

- Page three, first paragraph, references 22 to 28, are you sure all of this therapies have assessed in pregnant women? Please check this references again.

We have checked these references again and revised this section.

- Page three, methods and materials section, second paragraph, line 1 and 2, please report the number of first or second pregnancies in both groups, in result section, as we will comment in Table.

We have reported the number of pregnancy in the results section as well as in the Table 1.

- Page four, sampling section, first line, how many of this centers entered in your study? And in what basis? What do you mean: crowded (how many population?) and various? Please make available exact information.

We have provided information in this regard in the sampling subsection of Methods and materials section.

-Page five, paragraph one, and line four, socio-demographic by participants? It is unusual.

We have revised this section.

-Page six, first line, these groups were in which sizes, 3 or 5 or ... mothers in each group?

We have clarified it in the intervention subsection of Methods and materials section.

-Page six, data collection tools section, line second, and were completed through interview? Completed by who? Mothers themselves? There is some ambiguous, this scale is a self-report inventory.

We agree with dear reviewer. We have revised the first paragraph of data collection tools subsection of Methods and materials section.

-Page seven, results section, paragraph one, these numbers don't match with Fig.1 Please, check them again.

We have revised the first paragraph of results section.

-No problem with these 2 lines.

We appreciate the dear reviewer.

-page ten, paragraph one, as I found out, 2 researchers were involved in the sampling, not the other staff, for privacy of participants.

We appreciate your observations regarding the privacy of participants. We have observed it. The purpose of the collaboration of staff was to facilitate access of researchers to the records of the participants.

-Page twelve, references section, please, check your citations and references again, for example 22, 23.

We have checked all references again.

-add * for these variable, Mean (SD)

We have added * for these variables.

- Page eighteen, table 2, comments in uploaded PDF. (The sum of these numbers doesn’t match with 35. please, determine number of first and second pregnancies in both group. type of delivery is related to previous delivery.

We have determined number of first and second pregnancies in both groups in Table 1.

- Page twenty, figure one, comments in uploaded PDF (and finally you analyzed 34 or 35?). please, check this figure again.

We have checked the figure. We have analyzed 34 participants in each group. We have corrected the text.

-Chi-squared test where was used?

We have deleted it.

Reviewer 2:

- According to other studies, what was the prevalence of anxiety disorders in pregnant women in Iran?

We have reported the prevalence of anxiety in pregnant women in the Introduction section.

- No effective factors have been identified to cause anxiety disorders

Effective factors have been reported at the end of first paragraph of Introduction section.

-Please note the difference in the effects of anxiety disorders in the different months of pregnancy.

We have noted the difference in the effects of anxiety disorders in the different months of pregnancy at the end of first paragraph of Introduction section.

-Please refer to how anxiety disorders affect fetal health.

We have referred to this issue at the second paragraph of Page 2 and first paragraph of Page 3.

-Have other studies indicated that education is effective in reducing anxiety disorders in pregnancy?

We have cited the studies that indicated education is effective in reducing anxiety disorders in pregnancy at the last paragraph of Introduction section.

Have other studies indicated that education is effective in reducing anxiety disorders in -?pregnancy

We have selected women with at least high school diploma because we have used the writing .therapy for intervention

- It is best to summarize the method of conducting the study.

Thank you for your time investment in our work. We have reported the methods section based on CONSORT statement and it seems that all explanations are necessary.

- Please explain the results in more detail

We have explained the results in more details.

- Better to use newer studies

We have used the newer studies.

- Here are some other ways to reduce and compare anxiety disorders in pregnancy

We have reported the effects of other ways to reduce anxiety disorders in pregnancy.

:(Reviewer 3)

-If they were “healthy”, why did you do the intervention?

We agree with dear reviewer. We have deleted the word of healthy.

-How did you conclude this part of the sentence?

This study was conducted on pregnant women with moderate anxiety with the low sample size. In addition, definitive conclusion is based on the results of a systematic review with inclusion of several trials conducted with robust design and without biases.

- Individual therapy and group therapy are not distict forms of psychotherapy.

Thank you for your time investment in our work. We have considered your comment.

- Didn’t you consider “anxiety” as a “mental illness”? Did you consider “anxiety” as a “symptom”? Did you exclude patients suffering from “anxiety disorders”, such as “Generalized Anxiety Disorders”?

We agree with dear reviewer. We didn’t consider anxiety as a mental illness. In this study, mental illness was an exclusion criterion. We have used the BAI that specifically measures

the severity of clinical anxiety symptoms. We have included women with moderate anxiety and the women with severe anxiety were referred to a psychiatrist.

-What did you do with women who were "occasional substance users" or "substance abusers"?

According to self-reports, none of the women wasn't "occasional substance users" or "substance abusers".

-You have mentioned previously.

Thank you for your time investment in our work. We have deleted it.

-Did the participants complete the BAI in each session?

Anxiety questionnaire was completed at the end of the third counseling session (after six weeks). We have reported this issue in the last paragraph of page 6.

-What about the psychometric properties of Persian version of this inventory?

We have reported the psychometric properties of Persian version of this inventory at the end of data collection tools subsection of Methods section.

-What do you mean? The figure 1 is the flowchart of the participants.

We agree with dear reviewer. Figure 1 show the flowchart of the participants.

- "Education of at least high school diploma" was one of the inclusion criteria.

Having at a least high school was the criterion for inclusion. We have revised it in the inclusion criteria and Table 1.

-Being a housewife is not a job.

We agree with dear reviewer. We have corrected it in the text and Table 1.

- Please check (Page 9, first paragraph).

Thank you for your time investment in our work. It is correct.

- More explanation is needed (Page 9, first paragraph)

We have explained more.

- More explanation is needed (Page 10. Line 10)

We have explained more.

- Please check (Page10, first paragraph)

Thank you for your time investment in our work. It is correct.

- More explanation is needed. Did you follow the case three months after the end of your intervention?

The follow-up period of our study was different from the Anderson et al. study. We have revised this section.

-"Education of at least high school diploma" was one of the inclusion criteria (Page 19).

Having at a least high school was the criterion for inclusion. We have revised it in the inclusion criteria and Table 1.

Thanks

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) 22 Mar 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 3 Apr 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.