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.99492
Published in: Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 14(2); e99492

Peer Review Report for "Psychometric Properties of Persian Version of Body Image Shame Scale: A Study in Cosmetic Surgery Clinics"

Author(s): Sajad Khanjani, Banafsheh Gharraee, Abbas Ramezani Farani, Aliakbar Foroughi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 16 Nov 2019
Revised Date: 29 Mar 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: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 9 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
From an overall perspective, the article is innovative. Printable with bug fixes
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 6 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
- The procedure is not clear
- The basis for selecting the sample size is unclear
- The sampling method is unclear
- The validity and reliability of some questionnaires were not written in iran
Thanks.

Yazdan Naderi Rajeh: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 2 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
1- In introduction mention previous work and put your study in the body of literature
2- How select participants
3- Method of sampling?
4- Please mention the psychometric Properties of Persian Version of instruments that have been used in this study
5- Suggestion for future research?
6- In the discussion section please relate explanations with the points that mentioned in the introduction
7- In discussion section please explain why your findings were consistent or inconsistent with the previous study
8- The reference need to be up to date (5 last years)
Thanks.

Yazdan Naderi Rajeh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 2 Feb 2020

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) 7 Feb 2020

Dear Authors,
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 (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.

Hello:

Thank you for the comments that Reviewers have made to improve the quality of the article. All items raised by reviewers (Except: *the reference need to be up to date (5 last years)) have* been corrected and highlighted (Of course, the revised terms including grammar, editing, and references are not highlighted). Only references explaining theoretical foundations and research instruments are over 5 years. The rest of the research has been done in recent years.

With all my respect

Thanks for your time

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) 22 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

Yazdan Naderi Rajeh: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 25 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
1- Instead of the item number, it is better to have the item sentence completely (it would be checked by editor and couldn't; be plagiarism)
2- In first time abbreviation should be write completely (SD{standard deviation})
3- In page 12 "First a confirmatory factor analysis …" is incorrect, replaced with "exploratory"
4- Please explain in one or two sentences about Figure1
5- "somatic symptom and related disorder" this term is a category of disorders so please add "s" to disorder in all of the manuscript
6- In discussion: "The results confirmed the validity of this scale. In addition, the reliability of this scale was assessed, and it was found that this scale could serve as a reliable scale. The results confirmed the one-factor structure of this scale." this sentences are telegraphic please integrate this sentences in all of your discussion section, and give help from an English language expert
7- In discussion: "this disorder" should be replaced with "these disorders"
8- In conclusion, shouldn't repeated the results. this section need to be completely modified
Thanks.

Yazdan Naderi Rajeh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 24 Mar 2020

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some major revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (1)** 25 Mar 2020

Dear Authors,

Thank you for your recent revisions.

Your paper has now been evaluated again. According to the reviewers' and associate editor's comments it needs some more revisions. Please do your revisions according to these 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.

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.

Hello:

Thank you for the comments that Reviewers have made to improve the quality of the article. According to the comments, the reviewer 2's comments are related to another article (*two of the comments were related to the article highlighted in the text*).

With all my respect

Thanks for your time

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) — 3 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
All previously requested items have been corrected
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) — 10 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

Yazdan Naderi Rajeh: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) — 13 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

Yazdan Naderi Rajeh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) — 13 Apr 2020

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

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.