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

Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics
Article DOI: 10.5812/compreped.81539
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 11(4); e81539

Peer Review Report for "Effects of Interventional Training Program on Interpersonal Skills in Female Teenagers: A Case Control Study"

Author(s): Parasto Karimi, Fathola Mohamadian, Yousef Veisani, Sehat Aibod

Review Timeline:

- Submit Date: 30 Jun 2018
- Revised Date: 25 Apr 2020
- Accepted Date: 19 Oct 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) — 19 Mar 2019

Dear AE,
I received the paper entitled "Effects of Interventional Training program on Interpersonal Skills in Female Teenagers" as a reviewer. In my point of view, it is a good paper that needs minor revisions. So, I insert all my comments in the attached file so you can follow for required revisions.
My major concern is about ethical considerations that I want you to insert the received code from the related ethical committee.
Kind Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 25 Jun 2019

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor 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 (0)** 25 Jun 2019

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
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.

Reply to Reviewers

1- It is better to add the study type in title
Reply: It is done

2- It is a suggestion and not a conclusion
Reply: it is the corrected manuscript

3- Replace with those compatible with MeSH system
Reply: It is done

4- You must mention all ethical aspects and specially the received ethics code
Reply: It is done

5- In what age range?
Reply: It is done

6- What about exclusion criteria?
Reply: It is done

7- Please add more details of data gathering
Who was responsible for?
Did you perform face to face interview for each test?
Did you ask the participants to complete the test in the school time or they can send it to you at any time else?
What about ethical considerations? whom did you asked for inform consent? the participant or their family?
etc.
Reply: It is done

8- How did you perform the categorization? which scores considered as bad and which ones are good
Reply: It is done

9- Please insert demographic data of the participants. Their mean age and school grade, and other that might be useful
Reply: it is done

10- There is not!
Table 1 belongs to "**Summary of training for social skills training program"**
It should be revised as table 2
Reply: It is done

11- Please compare baseline (pre-test) in two group and add the related p-value. Based on table 2, it seems that there are some variables with significant difference at baseline!
Reply: it is done

12-Based on the reported data some scores decreased and some other increased after intervention. So You have to explain the grading in methods part.
Reply: it is done

13- You have to add a row above Intervention-Control and insert this word there
Reply: It is done
14- The explenatios of the results should inserted in discussion. It is a good sentence for starting the Discussion part, in which you have to clearly reply to the main aim of the study that was mentioned at the end of introduction part.
Reply: It is done

15- You have to clearly reply to the main aim of the study here that was mentioned at the end of introduction part.
Reply: It is done

16- Add limitations of your study
Reply: It is done

The Table(s) is(are) not mentioned in the text correctly. Please, mention the Table(s) in the text consecutively (Table 1).
Reply: it is done

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 Oct 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is acceptable now after this revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 19 Oct 2020

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.