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

Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences
Article DOI: 10.5812/zjrms.64126
Published in: Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences: 22(1); e64126

Peer Review Report for "Psychopathology in a Patient with Lujan-Fryns Syndrome: A Case Report"

Author(s): Forouzan Elyasi, Arghavan Fariborzifar , Zahra Kashi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 16 Nov 2017
Revised Date: 10 Aug 2019
Accepted Date: 31 Aug 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) — 20 Feb 2018

Dear AE,
- The method that used in reference writing is a not correct example, a number of continued text refer to the same reference repeated, and some references are missed or there are a gap between them.
- Use Endnote soft wear in references writing.
- Figures and Tables haven't the correct title.
- In the text figure 3 referred to two figures.
- Check the size of picture.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 21 Feb 2018

Dear AE,
- The grammatical errors are noticeable.
- Abstract is poor and disorganized.
- The conclusion isn't suitable.
- The article needs basic changes and revision.
- The figures need to crap and revise.
- Please write references in Vancouver's style.

- Please transfer para clinic into context.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 4 Mar 2018

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

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 5 Mar 2018

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) 5 Mar 2018

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 Dr.Alireza Bakhshipour

Editor-in-Chief Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences of Research in Medical

.Thank you for considering our manuscript for publication in your Journal

We had to make changes in our review paper according to what the reviewers suggested. We .hope we have appropriately addressed all commands

Title page is checked again and is completed correctly.

This article was edited by a language translator. Endnote soft wear used for references writing. Correct title for figures and tables added. References writhed according to Vancouver's style and corrected.

,Yours sincerely

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) 25 Jan 2019

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
- Although you used Endnote soft wear, in the text it not used properly.
- Write complete abbreviation in the first.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 13 Feb 2019

Dear AE,
It is a rare case report in the psychiatric field.
It is written well. But, I suggest some points.
- Please respect the structure for abstract
- In the abstract section, final conclusion is incomplete
- The keywords aren't as mesh.
- Psychotic disturbance isn't true. It is a psychotic symptom.
- psychogenic loss of appetite isn't true It is anorexia nervosa.
- Please consider other differential diagnoses.
- Please clarify the onset of symptoms step by step and explain the course of the disease.
- Please clarify the type of self-harm.
- It isn't true normal general appearance" about this patient. Please express their face and facial expression to him.
- Valve is true no valvue
- Explain the history of substance use
- insert disorder for the disease.
- Use of newer references.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 16 Feb 2019

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (1)** 16 Feb 2019

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
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.

Dear Editor of chief

We thank the reviewers for their careful read and thoughtful comments on previous draft. We have carefully taken their comments into consideration in preparing our revision, which has resulted in a paper that is clearer, more compelling, and broader. The following summarizes how we responded to reviewer comments.

Best regard

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
_ although you used Endnote soft wear, in the text it not used properly.

Answer: We used again and appropriately Endnote Soft Wear.

_ Write complete abbreviation in the first

Answer: We wrote complete abbreviation in the first.(LINE:10,84)

Reviewer 2:
Thanks for your suitable paper

It is a rare case report in psychiatric field

It is written well.
But, I suggest some points.

Please respect structure for abstract

Answer: This item has been corrected.(lines:6,11,15)
In abstract section, final conclusion is incomplete

Answer: This item has been corrected and final conclusion was revised.(line : 17,18)

The keywords aren't as mesh.

Answer: The keywords has been corrected.(line:19)
Psychotic disturbance isn't true. It is psychotic symptoms.

Answer: This item has been corrected
psychogenic loss of appetite isn't true It is anorexia nervosa.

Answer: Anorexia nervosa isn’t true in this section.
Please consider other differential diagnosis.

Answer: This item has been corrected
Please clarify onset of symptoms step by step and explain course of disease.
Please clarify type of self-harm.(line:53)
It isn't true ' normal general appearance" about this patient. Please express face and facial expression about him.
Valve is true no valvue(line:73)
Modify final conclusion(line:148-154)
Explain about history of substance use (line:61)
insert disorder for disease.
Use of newer references.(Referense:10)

Answer: All above items has been 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) — 7 Mar 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks for revision
Please the authors consider full name in the conclusion section.
Please arrange as Vancouver's style.
(1). De Hert et al. (1996)
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) — 14 Mar 2019

Dear AE,
- Comments were done, but in lines 236 to 143, the text has only 1 reference that repeated continuously, only one time and the end of the text use the reference number.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) — 6 Apr 2019

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) — 6 Apr 2019

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS AND SUGGESTION

Dear Editor:

We thankful from the reviewers for their careful reading and thoughtful comments on previous draft. We have carefully taken their comments into consideration in preparing our revision, which has resulted in a paper that is clearer, more compelling, and broader. We tried to respond to your valuable comments as following.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
- Comments were done, but in lines 236 to 143, the text has only 1 reference that repeated continuously, only one time and the end of the text use the reference number.

Answer: this section is edited
Reviewer 2:

Thanks for revision
Please consider full name in conclusion section
Please arrange as vancouver's style.
(1). De Hert et al. (1996)

Answer: Answer: this section is edited

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (3) 9 Jul 2019

Thanks for your valuable study
It is a rare case report in the field of psychiatry.
The authors have revised the manuscript as reviewers' opinion.
But there are some points, yet.
- Please mention the below comments :
- remove 1991 line 21.
- Line 39 No LFS: change to Any LFS.
- 95: Remove rejection and add rule out.
- 104: The disease of our patient delete and insert It was been diagnosed...
- Please do bold in titles in the abstract section.
- 108: Remove 1991.
- 123: remove 1996.
- 149: Mental disorders; Remove s from disorders.
- Please crop the pictures and decline the size of the pictures.
- Consider a number for all pictures and explain the content of the picture bottom it, completely.
- Please study the manuscript again, precisely, and check it, grammatically.
Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (3) 9 Jul 2019

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (3) 9 Jul 2019

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (4)

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 Dr. Alireza Bakhshipour

Editor-in-Chief Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences

.We hope, we have appropriately addressed all commands .

,Yours sincerely

Dr. Elyasi

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Thanks for your valuable study
It is a rare case report in field of psychiatry.
The authors have revised manuscript as reviewers' opinion.
But there are some points, yet.
Please mention below comments :

remove 1991 line 21
Line 39 No LFS : change to Any LFS
95 : Remove rejection and add rule out
Answer: this section is edited

104 : The disease of our patient delete and insert It was been diagnosed....

Please do bold in titles in abstract section
108 : Remove 1991
Answer: this section is edited

123 : remove 1996

149 : Mental disorders ; Remove s from disorders
Answer: this section is edited

Please crop the pictures and decline size of pictures

Consider a number for all pictures and explain about content of picture bottom it, completely

Answer: Tables and figure are prepared suitable
Please study the manuscript again , precisely and check it , grammatically.
Regards

Answer: The manuscript in edited.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (4)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (4) 29 Jul 2019

Dear AE,
The authors have revised the manuscript as reviewer's comments.
But, there are some points, they should resolve.
- Please change some subjects and send the manuscript again.
- What is the meaning of psychological follow-up? Please explain better.
- Line 39 remove change to
- LFS was the final diagnosis after a rule out of diseases with 96 similar symptoms. Please write as LFS was the final diagnosis after a rule out of differential diagnosis.
- Line 188 Please check the size of the words.
- Line 198 Please Bold word " Table "
- Please do crop for figures.
- Please consider the number for every figure and mark it in context.
The Best

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (4) 30 Jul 2019

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (4) 4 Aug 2019

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (5)

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 Dr. Alireza Bakhshipour

Editor-in-Chief Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences

.We hope, we have appropriately addressed all commands .

,Yours sincerely

:Associate Editor's Comments

.What is meaning of psychological follow up? Please explain better

Answer: psychological assessment

…,LFS patients need special educational services, psychological assessment

Line 39 remove change to

Answer: this section is edited

LFS was the final diagnosis after a rule out of diseases with 96 similar symptoms. Please write as .LFS was the final diagnosis after a rule out of differential diagnosis

Answer: this section is edited

.Line 188 Please check size of words

Answer: this section is edited

“ Line 198 Please Bold word “ Table

Answer: this section is edited

.Please do crop for figures

Answer: this section is edited

.Please consider number for every figure and mark it in context

.**Answer: It is highlighted in text**

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (5)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (5) 16 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks to the authors for their attempt to the revision of the manuscript
- Please arrange tables 3 and 4. Because the number of it is displaced.
- It needs for the crop of figures, yet.
- Please start the explanation of the figure with a capital letter.
Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (5) 31 Aug 2019

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (5) 31 Aug 2019

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.