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

Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Article DOI: 10.5812/semj.105674
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 22(7); e105674

Peer Review Report for "The Investigation of the Effectiveness of Mobile-based Psychoeducation in Patients with Bipolar Disorder: A Randomized Controlled Trial (RCT)"

Author(s): Roghayeh Ershad Sarabi, Zahra Ebnehoseini, Afshin Sarafi Nejad, Farzazd Akbarzadeh, Maliheh Ziaee, Zohreh Hashemi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 13 Jun 2020
Revised Date: 27 Oct 2020
Accepted Date: 22 Nov 2020

Revision (0)

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

Behnam Honarvar: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 30 Jun 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) — 30 Jun 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.

Subject: Response to Shiraz E-Medical Journal Referees' comments

Dear Dr Kamran B. Lankarani;
We thank the reviewers for their constructive criticisms, and the time spent on analyzing the manuscript "The Investigation of the Effectiveness of Mobile-Based Psychoeducation in Patients with Bipolar Disorder: A Randomized Control Trail (RCT)".
We would first like to thank the reviewers for all their comments. We will use the following format: (1) red text is used when we directly quote the reviewers; (2) black text is our response; and (3) yellow highlighted text is used for language improvements and green highlighted text shows changes in the text to response the reviewer comments.

Subject

Comment :

Results The results showed that the score of anxiety, depression, and mania at baseline and after the follow-up had not a significant decrease within the groups. But, a considerable reduction in the score depression and anxiety within the groups were found. The mean of anxiety (p-value: 0.035), depression (p-value: 0.024), and mania (p-value: 0.007) after 3 month follow-up had a significant decrease between the groups.

Answer: The sentence was corrected.

Comment:

Thank you for paying attention to this important topic, but your manuscript has a weak method, poor showing of results and non-well processed discussion. Please, consider and answer to all points precisely ,if not we may apologize for can not publishing it.

Please
Answer: We do our best and edited the manuscripts.

Comment

3-Profound English editing in whole of manuscript is necessary.

Answer: A native English language edited the manuscript. The yellow highlighted word and sentences are language improvements.

Comment

Results The results showed that the score of anxiety, depression, and mania at baseline and after the follow-up had not a significant decrease within the groups. But, a considerable reduction in the score depression and anxiety within the groups were found. The mean of anxiety (pvalue: 0.035), depression (p-value: 0.024), and mania (p-value: 0.007) after 3 month follow-up had a significant decrease between the groups.
Answer: The sentence was corrected.

Comment

Due to points that highlighted by the comments in the result part,about depression ,you can not have such conclusion.

Answer: The conclusion was major revised.

Comment:
sample evidence : what does it mean?
Answer: the sentence was corrected.

Comment: Mobile
Answer: The error was corrected

Comment: discussed

Answer: The error was corrected

Comment-RCT registry number?

Answer: The IRCT code was added. (IRCT20190520043645N1)

Comment

Did you register in the RCT registry sites?

Answer: Yes, The IRCT code was added in the paper.

Comment

If you conducted this study in two centers of Mashhad University, why you did not receive the ethical code from this university instead of Kerman University?

Answer: The research was conducted with the permission of the Mashhad Research Deputy.

Comment

Please, compare the definition of Single blind RCT with your method? Your method

that was explained here is not blind.

Answer: The sentence was corrected.

Comment-At the end ...

Answer: The error was corrected

Comment
What was your aims of installing the APP. on the mobile of Control group?

Answer: At the end of study when two groups completed the questionnaires (three months follow up) and data gathering was completed, the application was installed on mobile of the volunteer participants in control group. So, control group after study can use the education material.

Comment16-reference?

Answer: the reference number was added.

Comment17-reference?

Answer: the reference number was added.

Comment18-Young Mania Rating Scale

Answer: The error was corrected.

Comment19-reference?

Answer: The references number were added.

Comment 20-more than 12

Answer: The error was corrected.

Comment21-provided instead of needed

Answer: **The error was corrected**

Comment22-reference?

Answer: The error was corrected.

Comment-Figure 1 shows ...

Answer: The error was corrected

Comment-please, take the help of a biostatistics and perform these steps:

1. show other general characteristics in the table 1 (as level of education,marital status, co-morbidities, Income, duration of disease or medical treatment , habits ,...)

2. Perform Multiple variable analysis.

Answer : Patients' demographic information was reviewed and 4 items of education, length of treatment, and marital status were added.

Comment-What was (were) the reasons for loss to FU? moreover,in the fig.1 you mentioned 13 cases (in the intervention group) did not receive intervention, this is different from lost to F/U.

Answer

Answer: "All intervention group received the mobile app but, some they lost the follow up. Reasons for lasting follow-up included readmission of the patient during the study (exit criteria), unwillingness to continue cooperation, and loss of mobile phone. Finally, out of 60 participants, 17 and 24 of them included in the analysis in the intervention and control group, respectively." This explanation was added to the manuscript.

Comment-gender (instead of sex)

Answer: The error was corrected.

Comment-if p=0.000 put p<0.001

Answer: The error was corrected.

Comment-what does it mean (this sentence)?

Answer: It was removed.

Comment-females (instead of women)
Answer: The error was corrected

Comment-figure2 shows CONSORT diagram and its application in this study.
Answer: The error was corrected

Comment-table 1 shows ...

Answer: The error was corrected

Comment 32-incomplete sentence

Answer: the sentence was corrected.

Comment-the changes were not considerable

Answer: the sentence was corrected.

Comment-these figures were mirror of the table2

Answer: the figures were removed from the text.

Comment-these figures were mirror of the table2

Answer: the figures were removed from the text.

Comment-showed a statistically ...

Answer: the sentence was corrected.

Comment-the figures in this paragraph is different from table 3

Answer: The figures were checked and corrected.

Comment-because baseline depression score score between two groups was different (p=0.04 ,table3),This shows that 2 groups were not the same from the beginning, so the changes in scores after 3 months F/U can not be attributed to the intervention

Answer

The results of Paired sample t-test tests showed that the score of anxiety, depression, and mania at baseline and after three months follow-up had not a significant decrease within the intervention and

control group. The p-value of depression had an error typing. The right p-value is 0.07 in the baseline that is not significant in the baseline.

Comment39-because baseline depression score score between two groups was different (p=0.04 ,table3),This shows that 2 groups were not the same from the beginning, so the changes in scores after 3 months F/U can not be attributed to the intervention

Answer: The explanation in the discussion section was revised.

Comment40-meaningless and incomplete sentence

Answer: The sentence were removed from the text.

Comment41-discussed

Answer: The error was corrected.

Comment42-provides

Answer: The error was corrected.

Comment43-because baseline depression score score between two groups was different (p=0.04 ,table3),This shows that 2 groups were not the same from the beginning, so the changes in scores after 3 months F/U can not be attributed to the intervention

Answer

The results of Paired sample t-test tests showed that the score of anxiety, depression, and mania at baseline and after three months follow-up had not a significant decrease within the intervention and control group. The p-value of depression had an error typing. The right p-value is 0.07 in the baseline that is not significant in the baseline.

Comment44-Yours Conflict of Interest in this study?

Answer: Conflict of Interest section was added to text.

Comment - رفرانس ها را کامل و با فرمت اندنوت بنویسید

Answer: The references were revised.

Comment46-Where did you cite the ref.22 in the text?

Answer: The references were revised.

Comment47-Table 1 should show other important background characteristics such as : education , marital status, duration of psychiatric disease , duration of being under treatment and type of treatment?,Income

Answer: Patients' demographic information was reviewed and 4 items of education, length of treatment, and marital status were added.

Comment-define number . n (%) in each cell

Answer: N (%) was added in each cell.

Comment-ages are overlapped.

Answer: the overlap was corrected.

Comment-the figures in the text of result (lines182 ...) are different with table (you put these figures instead of each other)

Answer: The signs and figure was checked and corrected.

Comment51-By comparing table 2 and 3 and regarding signs (- /+),it seems that the figures were inserted wrong. for example :table 2 : depression changed by -1.7 but in the table 2 (11.82-10.12=1.7)

Answer: The signs and figure was checked and corrected.

Comment-In the Arm of Control group :Did not receive allocated intervention.

Answer: In the control group 6 patients and in the intervention group 13 patients lost the follow-up. The COSORT diagram was edited.

Comment-in the intervention group: 13 cases lost to FU (YOU SAID DID NOT RECEIVE INTERVENTION !!

Answer: In the control group 6 patients and in the intervention group 13 patients lost the follow-up. The COSORT diagram was edited.

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) 29 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1. There was no information about random sampling, random allocation, and instruments in the abstract. Also, n=41 is correct.
2. Remove the following: A baseline comparison was performed between the groups, comparisons of the primary outcomes between the groups and within each group were carried out.
3. Report the main findings quantitatively in the abstract via descriptive statistics.
4. Method of sampling and method of random allocation is not clear.
5. There was no information about sample size calculation.
6. In the findings, remove the name of the tests.
7. The significant difference in the frequency of age was not considered in statistical analysis??
8. Report exact P-value in Table 1.
9. Remove Table 2.
10. In Table 3, also include within group comparisons.
11. There was no (clinically or statistically) significant improvement.
Thanks.

Behnam Honarvar: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 3 Sep 2020

Dear EIC,
Despite the authors' attempts to revise the manuscript, controversial findings in some aspects such as baseline depression score from the 1st version, weak methodology, loss to follow up in 43% of the intervention group, confusing abstract, lack of assessment of some important co-variates, no novelty, restricted results to the only hospital-referred patients, being only single-blinded of method and no approving number of Mashhad Research deputy make this report in overall not strong.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 4 Sep 2020

Dear Authors,
A major revision is needed. It is suggested that the article be formatted as a brief report .

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.

Subject: Response to Shiraz E-Medical Journal Referees' comments

Dear Dr Kamran B. Lankarani;
We thank the reviewers for their constructive criticisms, and the time spent on analyzing the manuscript "The Investigation of the Effectiveness of Mobile-Based Psychoeducation in Patients with Bipolar Disorder: A Randomized Control Trail (RCT)".
We would first like to thank the reviewers for all their comments. We will use the following format: (1) red text is used when we directly quote the reviewers; (2) black text is our response; and (3) yellow highlighted text is used for language improvements and green highlighted text shows changes in the text to response the reviewer comments.

Comment:
1. There was no information about random sampling, random allocation and instruments in the abstract. Also n=41 is correct.
A brief explanation of random sampling was added to the abstract.

Comment:
2. Remove the following: A baseline comparison was performed between the groups, comparisons of the primary outcomes between the groups and within each group were carried out.
The sentence was removed.

3. Report the main findings quantitatively in the abstract via descriptive statistics.
Answer
The main findings was reported quantitatively in the abstract via descriptive statistics.

Comment:

9. Remove Table 2.

According to the reviewer comments in revision 1, the mean and SDs was removed from the text and was reported in the table 2.

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.

Behnam Honarvar: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) — 21 Nov 2020

Dear AE
Thanks to the authors for the manuscript improvement.
Regards.

Behnam Honarvar: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) — 21 Nov 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) — 22 Nov 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.