Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Volume 23 · Issue 6 · e113737

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Risk Factors of Premarital Sex Among University Girl Students: A Qualitative Study

Fatemeh Rahmanian, Nooshin Zarei, Nasrin Motazedian

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
14 Feb 2021	10 Nov 2021	1 Dec 2021	10.5812/semj.113737

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Associate Editor 2
2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6
3 **Revision 2** Associate Editor 7
Authors' reply to reviewers 8
Reviewer and editor comments 9

1 Original submission

2 comments · 25 Mar 2021 – 30 Apr 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 25 Mar 2021

Dear Authors

Please revise your manuscript precisely according to the points mentioned in the attached PDF file.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 30 Apr 2021

Dear authors

Thank you for selecting and researching this challenging topic. Please respond carefully and point by point to all comments (one reviewer's comments are in the attached PDF, and the second reviewer's comments are on the page). Please note that, after review of your revised version, it may be considered for any type of publication, such as a short communication, and not necessarily as an original article.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

Please revise your manuscripts precisely, according to the mentioned points in the attached PDF file.

***Reply**: Dear reviewer, I tried my best to apply your suggestions. As another reviewer suggested to reorganize the result, some part of the manuscript was changed. Below you can find my response to your comments.*

1- *I mean sexual relationships. It was corrected*
2- *College students changed to university students*
3- *I wrote direct conclusion in the conclusion part at the end of the manuscript and also in the abstract*
4- *References 3 to 5 were added*
5- *Reference 12 was added*
6- *Name of the place was deleted*
7- *Due to the sensitivity of the title, In the ethics committee, we promised not to mention the name of the universities.*
8- *As I mentioned,* snowball sampling was used. I added more details.
9- *As you know, the snowball sampling usually cannot be representative of the study population. As this was the best sampling method for the studied subject, there is no need for the sample to be representative. In addition, the sample size of the study is very rational for a qualitative one with a sensitive topic.*
10- *limitations of the study were added*
11- *Conclusion was revised.*

Reviewer 2:
Dear author/s
1. The number of participants (24) is not the same as the number of interviews (28). Please correct it.
***Reply**: it was corrected.*

2. The two main groups you obtained lack attributes. It is necessary to identify the features of personal and social factors. This requires re-analysis of groups and subgroups.

***Reply**: The results were revised and rewritten*

3. From the text set aside for judgment, good judgment is not deduced.

***Reply**: the text is revised*

4. Groups and subgroups are not known and the content is much cluttered, so the article can be reviewed after the groups and subgroups have been identified.

***Reply**: All results were reanalyzed and rewritten*

5. The results are not clear. The descriptions are very few and only the text of the interviews has been entered.

***Reply**: it is revised*

6. The discussion is written haphazardly. Have a separate discussion about each theme obtained.

***Reply**: Thank you. The discussion was written separately for each group*

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Dear authors

Thanks to you for selecting and research on this challenging topic. Please answer to the all points (points by one reviewer was attached to the attached PDF and the 2nd on the page) carefully and point by point. Please, pay attention that after review of your revised version, it may be considered for any type of publication such as short communication and not necessarily as original form.

EIC Decision:

The article needs to be revised.
The title also needs to be revised .

How to Revise?

Please sign in to the journal with your account and follow the instruction to resubmit your revised paper. With respect to time limits, we are looking forward to hearing from you soon in the mentioned time frame.

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 20 Oct 2021

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 20 Oct 2021

Thank you for the revisions. However, it would be better to delete " challenges" from the title.

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Thank you for revisions, although in the title " challenges" is better to be deleted.

Dear the associate editor,

As you suggested, I deleted the word “challenges”.

The EIC suggested to change the title to “ risk factors of …”. We think it is better to delete the word “challenges” but the rest of the title remains.

Thank you again

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 28 Nov 2021

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 28 Nov 2021

Dear Authors
Thank you for choosing this interesting and critical topic and submitting your manuscript to this journal. Your manuscript needs major revision according to the reviewers' comments. Please respond to them point by point.