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

Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care
Article DOI: 10.5812/jjcdc.111199
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care: 10(2); e111199

Peer Review Report for "COVID-19 and Depression from the Nigerian Perspective; A Mini Review"

Author(s): John Chukwuma Oyem, Patrick Chukwuyenum Ichipi-Ifukor, Chukubueze Obi-Ojinika

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 14 Nov 2020
Revised Date: 8 Dec 2020
Accepted Date: 23 Dec 2020

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Arzu Kader HARMANCI SEREN: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 20 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
This mini-review aimed to evaluate the possible causes of depression among Nigerians during the
COVID-19 pandemic and to identify potential mitigating interventions to prevent depression. However, the author should work more on the manuscript to serve the aim. Although the introduction part is well written, it is too long for a mini-review. Thus, the main part of the manuscript tells nearly nothing to the reader about the situation, which findings were derived from the reviewed literature. No information about how many articles were evaluated. I recommend giving the main findings of the reviewed literature and adding a conclusion. Keywords should include "Nigeria."
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 25 Nov 2020

Dear AE
Thanks for submitting the manuscript to the JJCDC. There are some comments for the authors in my opinion to the article: COVID-19 AND DEPRESSION FROM THE NIGERIAN PERSPECTIVE ‘

This article is attractive to me and well written.

1- abstract:

suggestion: add the following words in the keywords: SARS-CoV-2; Coronavirus; Infection

2- Introduction

The introduction is too long for a mini-review. Please decrease it or if the information is necessary, add subheadings in the introduction.

3- Method

In the method section: mention more details. For example: draw a diagram for study selection. How many studies were identified? How many studies exclude? how many studies included? And etc. finally- mention inclusion criteria for study selection.

4- Results

Move guidelines in a table.

best regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 2 Dec 2020

Dear EIC,

This mini review is interesting but based on our reviewers comments need some revise. The authors should revise it and resubmit.

Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 2 Dec 2020

Dear Author,

Thank you for submitting your minireview in JJCDC. Based on our reviewers comments your manuscript need some revision in all section. Please revise and resubmit.

Thank you very much.

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.

Journal Name: Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care
Manuscript ID: 111199
Manuscript Title: COVID-19 AND DEPRESSION FROM THE NIGERIAN PERSPECTIVE; A MINI REVIEW [Revision 1]

Reviewers comment	Authors reaction
Add the following words in the key words: SARS-CoV-2; Coronavirus; Infection	Thank you this observation. The following key words have been added to the abstract.
Introduction is too long for as a mini review. Please decrease it or if the information is necessary, add subheadings in the introduction.	Another excellent observation. Authors have added appropriate subheadings to the manuscript where necessary. Thank you.
In the method section: mention more details. For example: draw a diagram for study selection. How many study were identified? How many study exclude? how many study included? And etc. finally- mention inclusion criteria for study selection.	Thank you for assessing our manuscript and pointing out this observation. Authors have provided a flow chart for the study selection and hopes it is more clearer
Move guideline in a table.	We agree with the reviewer that moving guideline in a table will be more elaborate. However, we believe that our recommended guidelines are well simplified and thus we highlighted them for clarity sake.
Although the introduction part is well written, it is too long for a mini-review. Thus, the main part of the manuscript tells nearly nothing to the reader about the situation, which findings were derived from the reviewed literature.	Thank you for commending our introduction. We have divided the introductory part into subheadings to make it comprehensible.
No information about how many articles were evaluated.	This observation is correct. We have provided information on the number of articles evaluated.
I recommend giving the main findings of the reviewed literature and adding a conclusion	We appreciate the reviewer's insightful suggestion. Since our article is a mini review, details of the main findings of reviewed literature are well stated in the body of the manuscript and even in the guidelines subheading. Based on these findings authors

	provided recommendations and conclusion
Keywords should include "Nigeria."	This has been added.

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) 11 Dec 2020

Dear AE,
It is acceptable for me.
Best regards

Arzu Kader HARMANCI SEREN: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 20 Dec 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks to the authors for considering my first review report and adding subheadings into the introduction, adding a flow chart for presenting the brief article selection methodology, and adding a conclusion and recommendations to the end of the mini-review.
Congratulations.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 23 Dec 2020

Dear EIC,
Based on our reviewers comments, it is acceptable for publication.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 23 Dec 2020

Dear Author,
Based on our reviewers comments your manuscript is acceptable in the current format.
Thank your very much