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

Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies
Article DOI: 10.5812/mejrh.103840
Published in: Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies: 7(3); e103840

Peer Review Report for "Relationship of Self-Differentiation and Social Intelligence with Happiness by Mediating Role of Difficulty in Cognitive Emotion Regulation Among Female-Headed Households"

Author(s): Masoumeh Dehdashti Lesani, Behnam Makvandi, Farah Naderi, Fariba Hafezi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	18 Apr 2020
Revised Date:	1 Jun 2020
Accepted Date:	17 Jun 2020

Revision (0)

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

Mohammad Ali Fardin: Reviewer | Revision (0) 19 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
Abstract:
1. Explain the Background more precisely.
2. Report the year of this study in the abstract.
Background:
1- The first and second paragraphs are so huge and just 2 references have been used. Authors should use more references by fewer descriptions
2- Write the results of several studies
3- at the end of the introduction report your hypothesis or question.
Methods:
1. The authors should Report how to determine sample size clearly.

2. How long did the study take?

3. Write the ethical considerations.

Conclusion:

1. Analyze and interpret the results of various studies.

2. Write the strengths of the study.

3. Edit the conclusion of the study and explain it more precisely.

References

1- Many references are so old and expired, Eliminate them

Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 5 May 2020

Dear AE,

Comments for the authors:

1. The code of ethics should be mentioned in the article.

2. Is this a structural model study was conducted on samples?

If yes, please explain.

3. Is the cognitive adjustment questionnaire validated and reliable?

If yes, please explain.

4. References 14, 16, 11, and 18 are not suitable for the validity and reliability of tests.

5. The working method is incomplete.

Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 14 May 2020

Dear EIC,

According to the reviewer's comments, the manuscript needs to be revised majorly.

Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 14 May 2020

Dear Author,

The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.

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.

Dear Editor,

Thank you for your valuable and useful comments and suggestions. We have modified the manuscript accordingly. Revised sections are highlighted in the article and detailed corrections are listed below point by point:

Reviewer 1:

- ✓ The present study aimed to investigate the mediating role of difficulty in cognitive emotion regulation in the relationships of self-differentiation and social intelligence with happiness among female-headed households. The study was a cross-sectional study that included 261 female-headed households. Analysis of the data involved both descriptive and inferential statistics including mean, standard deviation, Pearson's correlation, and path analysis. Data analysis was done using SPSS and AMOS software.
- ✓ Details of ethics considerations and approval were added to the article.
- ✓ The Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale (DERS): The difficulties in emotion regulation scale (DERS) was first developed by Gratz and Roemer (2004). The initial scale of difficulties in emotion regulation was a self-report 36-items measurement formulated to clinically assess difficulties in emotion regulation. This questionnaire has six components including rejection of emotional responses, difficulty in performing targeted behaviors, difficulty in control impulse, lack of emotional awareness, limited access to emotion regulation strategies, and lack of emotional clarity. The scale has an overall score and six sub-scores for each component. The internal consistency is 0.93 for questions and over 80% for each of the components (Kermani Mamazandi & Tale Pasand, 2018). In this study, the reliability of 0.88 was achieved for the whole questionnaire using Cronbach's alpha.

References:

Gratz KL, Roemer E. Multidimensional assessment of emotion regulation and dysregulation: development, factor structure, and initial validation of the difficulties in emotion regulation scale. Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment. 2004;62(1):11-41. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:JOBA.0000007455.08539.94

Kermani Mamazandi Z, Tale Pasand S. Psychometric Characteristics of Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale in Semnan University Students. Journal of Instruction and Evaluation, 2018;11(42):117-142. http://jinev.iaut.ac.ir/article_543435.html

- ✓ All references were reviewed and revised.
- ✓ The Methods section was completely revised and corrected, and details were added.

Reviewer 2:

- ✓ Background in the abstract explained more precisely.
- ✓ The Year of the study was added in the abstract.
- ✓ We thoroughly reviewed the Introduction section and rewrote it, and adding new references to the article.
- ✓ The question of the study reported at the end of the Introduction section.
- ✓ Details of the sampling method were added to the Methods section.
- ✓ Details of ethics considerations and approval were added to the article.
- ✓ The Year of the study was added in the Methods section.
- ✓ The discussion and conclusion section were completely rewritten and details were added.
- ✓ All references were reviewed and revised. New references were added to the article.

Associate Editor's Comments:

- ✓ We revised the manuscript carefully to avoid language errors. In addition, we asked several colleagues who are skilled authors to check the English. We believe that the language is now acceptable for the reviewer.
- ✓ All instruments were added to the article (Abstract and Methods sections).
- ✓ Important findings of the study reported in the “Results” section of abstract with (β and exact P values).
- ✓ The conclusion section was completely rewritten according to the objective of the study.

- ✓ Keywords chosen by using MeSH.
- ✓ The used abbreviation defined at the first time of use.
- ✓ Details of ethics considerations and approval were added to the Methods section.
- ✓ Questionnaires were filled with the participants' satisfaction and written informed consent was obtained from the participants in this study. (Details were added to the Methods section).
- ✓ Validity and reliability of used instruments presented in the research instruments.
- ✓ We used the maximum of two decimal places for presenting data.
- ✓ The table related to the mean and standard deviation of the scores (Table 1) was presented as Figure 1. (standard deviation of the mean represented as bars in Figure 1)
- ✓ All used abbreviations in the Tables defined in the legend of the Tables.
- ✓ All numbers and data are written in English format.
- ✓ The limitations of the study were added to Conclusion section.
- ✓ All the references were checked carefully, all mentioned references in the text introduced in the References section.
- ✓ Endnote software with Vancouver style was used to configure references.

The manuscript has been resubmitted to your journal. We look forward to your positive response.

With best regards

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) — 12 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
Paper issues have been fixed and it could be accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 16 Jun 2020

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

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 17 Jun 2020

Dear EIC,
According to the reviewers' comments on the revised manuscript. all comments have been addressed properly and no further issue was found to concern.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 17 Jun 2020

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
Thanks.