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.99449
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care: 9(1); e99449

Peer Review Report for "Effectiveness of Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy on Sleep Quality and Perceived Social Support Improvement in Patients with HIV/AIDS"

Author(s): Shahla Molavi, Naser Seraj Khorrami, Parvin Ehteshamzadeh, Mahdi Sayyah

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	9 Nov 2019
Revised Date:	22 Dec 2019
Accepted Date:	25 Dec 2019

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) — 4 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks for sending us the article and giving us the chance to consider this work. Unfortunately, I should inform the authors due to poor language and in some parts poor structure this work is not good enough for publication.
best regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 13 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks for submitting the nice manuscript with the title: Effectiveness of Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy in Sleep Quality and Perceived Social Support Improvement of HIV/AIDS Patients from Ahvaz. I think this study is important to research in the mental illness status but needs some revision before publication.
- In the abstract, you should explain more about background and conclusion.
- In the introduction, you should explain about research gap and problem clearly.
- In the method, in the first sentence you wrote semi-experimental study but next sentence

you told analytical study!!!!!. you should explain bout ethical consideration and ethical code. you should explain more clearly in sampling method. inclusion and exclusion criteria. you should from international semi-experimental guidelines to present your study more clearly. Is there any novelty in your study? Please describe it in the discussion. Please mention the limitation and strong points of your study. Is there any novelty in your study? Please describe it in the discussion.

- There are some spelling and grammatical errors in the text. Please correct them.

Truly yours.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 13 Dec 2019

Dear EIC,

Thanks for submitting this manuscript in JJCDC. This study is interesting in the chronic illness field. Based on our reviewers' comments the article needs some revisions in all parts of it. I give the authors a chance to revise their manuscript and resubmit.

With regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 13 Dec 2019

Dear Author,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript in JJCDC. This study is interesting in the chronic illness field. Based on our reviewers' comments your article needs some revisions in all parts of it. I give you a chance to revise your manuscript and resubmit.

With regards.

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.

Q: [*In the introduction, you should explain about research gap and problem clearly*]
R: [Corrected]

Q: [*In the abstract, you should explain more about background and conclusion*]
R: [Corrected]

Q: [*In the method, in the first sentence you wrote semi experimental study but next sentence you told analytical study*]
R: [Corrected]

Q: [*you should explain bout ethical consideration and ethical code*]
R: [Corrected]

Q: [*you should explain more clearly in sampling method*]
R: [Corrected]

Q: [*inclusion and exclusion criteria*]
R: [Corrected]

Q: [*you should from international semi experimental guidlines for present your study more clearly.*
Is there any novelty in your study]
R: [Corrected]

Q: [*Please mention the limitation and strong points of your study. Is there any novelty in your study? Please describe it in the discussion*]
R: [Corrected]

Q: [*There are some spelling and grammatical errors in the text. Please correct them*]
R: [Corrected]

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) 21 Dec 2019

Dear EIC,
The authors should revise their manuscript based on my comments.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 21 Dec 2019

Dear author,
There are some comments. attached file that should be corrected and submit again.
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.

Q: [*In the introduction, you should explain about research gap and problem clearly*]
R: [Corrected]

Q: [*In the abstract, you should explain more about background and conclusion*]
R: [Corrected]

Q: [*In the method, in the first sentence you wrote semi experimental study but next sentence you told analytical study*]
R: [Corrected]

Q: [*you should explain bout ethical consideration and ethical code*]
R: [Corrected]

Q: [*you should explain more clearly in sampling method*]
R: [Corrected]

Q: [*inclusion and exclusion criteria*]
R: [Corrected]

Q: [*you should from international semi experimental guidlines for present your study more clearly.*
Is there any novelty in your study]
R: [Corrected]

Q: [*Please mention the limitation and strong points of your study. Is there any novelty in your study? Please describe it in the discussion*]
R: [Corrected]

Q: [*There are some spelling and grammatical errors in the text. Please correct them*]
R: [Corrected]

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) 25 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
This manuscript in current version is acceptable but should write Ethical code and IRCT number at the end of article
thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 25 Dec 2019

Dear EIC,
All comments have made but the authors should write ethical code and IRCT in their manuscript.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 25 Dec 2019

Dear Author,
All comments have made. This manuscript in the current format is acceptable. Based on reviewer comments, you should write IRCT number in the end of your manuscript in the proof stage.
Thank you very much.