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

Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences
Article DOI: 10.5812/zjrms.77180
Published in: Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences: 22(3); e77180

# Peer Review Report for "The Relationship Between Obesity and Sexual Function in Iranian Women"

**Author(s):** Fatemeh Zahra Karimi, Hamid Heidarian Miri, Fatemeh Salehi, Nahid Maleki-Saghooni, Zahra Khosravi Anbaran, Leila Amiri-Farahani

## Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 12 May 2018
Revised Date: 22 Jul 2019
Accepted Date: 28 Sep 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)

15 May 2018

Dear AE,
The authors conducted a useful study but it has some defaults that I mentioned below:
1) In Abstract section, the authors did not mentioned the statistic tests that used in the study
2) Keywords have not been selected properly. What does FSFI mean?
3) The authors did not mention the studies which are related to the relationship between obesity and sexual function either in Iran or in foreign countries.
4) What is the novelty of this study?
5) Because the authors needed to specific population based on inclusion criteria, the purposeful sampling method is more probable.
6) Asking some of the exclusion criteria seems to be taboo in Iranian culture, how the authors dealt with this problem?
7) In method section, the authors did not mention the mean differences tests such as ANOVA and also it seems that the multiple linear regression analysis is not a good test for assessing the correlation. It would be good to use correlation test instead of regression.
8) How the authors assessed the mean differences in ordinal or nominal variables such as education, occupation and so on? There is no mention regarding nonparametric tests.

9) How the normal distribution ensured?
10) In the discussion section, the coherence is missing. It needs to be further discussed the relevant results. The explanation of the results is weak and in some parts, it does not have any rational explanation.
11) The format of tables is not compatible with standards. It would be good to revise the format of tables. For example in table 1, the column 2 has no title and it is not clear what are the numbers related to this column.
12) The type of statistic tests is missing in table 1 and 2.
13) Table3 should be substituted with correlation analysis. Regression analysis is not a proper test for assessing the correlation.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 18 Jun 2018

Dear AE,
Abstract and full text Especially methods isn't according to strobe cross-sectional checklist.
Thanks

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 19 Jun 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) 1 Jul 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.

Some points recommended:

1. Abstract section, the authors did not mention the statistic tests that used in the study. Answer: this part was added to article and highlighted.
2. Abstract methods aren't according to strobe cross–sectional checklist (no time or period, no questionnaire name, category BMI, and statistical methods). Answer: these parts were added to article and highlighted.
3. Key words have not been selected properly. What does FSFI mean Answer: this part was changed in the article.
4. The authors did not mention the studies which are related to the relationship between obesity and sexual function either in Iran or in foreign countries. Answer: this part was added to article and highlighted.
5. What is the novelty of this study?
6. Because the authors needed to specific population based on inclusion criteria, the purposeful sampling method is more probable. . Answer: this part was added to article and highlighted.
7. Asking some of the exclusion criteria seems to be taboo in Iranian culture, how the authors dealt with this problem? Answer: the questioners of study were filled by participants. The women also were assured of the confidentiality of the study.
8. In method section, the authors did not mention the mean differences tests such as ANOVA and also it seems that the multiple linear regression analysis is not a good test for assessing the correlation. It would be good to use correlation test instead of regression.

   Univariate analysis was not a preferable analysis for us because it couldn’t approach the problem of confounding. We used multiple linear regression as statisticians advised that multiple linear regression have superiority over correlation coefficient as it has properties correlation coefficient (R2) and also gives measure of associations (B’s). Besides, multiple linear regression is an accepted way to deal with confounding and can simultaneously assess the association of several independent variables with the dependent variable. However to include the independent variables in the final model we did performed univariate analysis (t-test, ANOVA, and chi square test) but we didn’t report the results to save time and space.

9. How the authors assessed the mean differences in ordinal or nominal variables such as education, occupation and so on? There is no mention regarding nonparametric tests.
   In all cases of mean differences, we calculated the mean difference of a quantitative variable like age, BMI, or FSFI of BMI over levels of qualitative (nominal and ordinal) variables like occupation or education.
10. How the normal distribution ensured? By the central limit theorem.

11. In discussion section, the coherence is missing. It needs to be further discussed the relevant results. The explanation of the results is weak and in some parts, it does not have any rational explanation.

12. The format of tables is not compatible with standards. It would be good to revise the format of tables. For example in table 1, the column 2 has no title and it is not clear what are the numbers related to this column. Answer: table 1abd 2 was edited and highlighted.
13. 12) The type of statistic tests is missing in table 1 and 2. Answer: these were added to table 1 and 2.
14. 13) Table3 should be substituted with correlation analysis. Regression analysis is not a proper test for assessing the correlation.
    We used multiple linear regression as statisticians advised that multiple linear regression have superiority over correlation coefficient as it has properties correlation coefficient (R2) and also gives measure of associations (B's). Besides, multiple linear regression is an accepted way to deal with confounding and can simultaneously assess the association of several independent variables with the dependent variable. However to include the independent variables in the final model we did performed univariate analysis (t-test, ANOVA, and chi square test) but we didn't report the results to save time and space.
15. In full text methods according to strobe cross–sectional checklist (There isn't location-There isn't periods data collection, potential confounders not defined for example educational level. There isn't Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias. Answer: theses parts were added to article and highlighted.

16. results is disordered and confused .descriptive data (eg demographic, social and information on exposures and potential confounders )report in table. And main results comparison score 3 groups , regression variables with 3 score in groups and…report in tables.
17. Confounders explain for control. Because, age and educatioinal level and job are sig in 3 groups.
18. Discussion reported weak, some of research comparison for example review article [Kolotkin RL et al Sexual functioning and obesity: a review],[ Larsen SH et al:Sexual function and obesity] or comparison instrument meaturment or ethnic and…with other articles

*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) 1 Nov 2018

Dear AE,
Thanks to the authors for conducting some amendments to the manuscript. now, the manuscript in the current format is acceptable but they should do a minor revision on that. it would be good to delete the depression score and quality of life score from the Table 1. because in a descriptive format these variables are questionable.
Thanks

**REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 3 Nov 2018

Dear AE,
1. Those point recommended by reviewers are valuable and sounds most important. my comments :
2. In the results section, it presented a confuse or vague. Results are either text presents or table presents.
3. In table: Variable depression and quality of life reported, therefore use in the discus section.
4. In the table scores report: mean score ...top of ...(total score)
5. In the section discussion, is presented weakly. authors must be according to details of result compare to details results of other articles for example: compare six domains sexual function tools (FSFI) this research with six domains other researches, for example, "women more commonly reported lack of sexual desire and orgasmic dysfunction (Richters et al., 2003)" and discuss why isn't similarity. why age, salary duration of the marriage, and age at first pregnancy significant with sexual function in 3 groups; it compares and challenges for discus and,...
6. In this study Mean age 3 group is 29/1 years. Therefore fluctuating hormones don't cause a decline in sexual function! Because, This changes in transition menopause in 40 and beyond y, also the relationship between estrogen and female sexual functioning is not as clear (DeLamater and Karraker, 2009; Diaz-Arjonilla et al., 2008).
best regards

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 5 Nov 2018

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)** 5 Nov 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 (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**

Thanks to the reviewer's comments , In The following Reply to reviewer's comments

*Sincerely*

1. *In table :Variable depression and quality of life reported ,therefore use in the discus section.*

Answer: this part was added to article and highlighted.

2. *In the section discussion,it presented weak. authors must be according details of result compare to details results of other articles for example: compare six domains sexual function tool's(FSFI) this research with six domains other researches,for example "women more commonly reported lack of sexual desire and orgasmic dysfunction (Richters et al., 2003)" and discus why isn't similarity . why age, salary duration of marriage and age at first pregnancy significanted with sexual function in 3 groups; it compare and challenge for discus and , ...*

Answer: this part was revised and highlighted

3. *In this sudy Mean age 3 group are 29/1 years. Therefor fluctuate hormones aren't cause decline sexual function! Because ,This changes in transition menopause in 40 and beyond y, also the relationship between estrogen and female sexual functioning is not as clear (DeLamater and Karraker, 2009; Diaz-Arjonilla et al., 2008).*

Answer: this part was revised and highlighted

**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.

**Shahin dokht Navabi rigi**: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 23 Sep 2019

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

**Alireza Bakhshipour**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 28 Sep 2019

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

**Alireza Bakhshipour**: EIC | **Revision** (2) 28 Sep 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.