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.95247
Published in: Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences: 23(2); e95247

Peer Review Report for "Prevalence of Body Dysmorphic Disorder and Its Association with Other Mental Comorbidities Among a Group of College Students in Shiraz"

Author(s): Abdulaziz Aflakseir, Somayeh Jamali, Javad Mollazadeh

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	7 Jul 2019
Revised Date:	10 Mar 2020
Accepted Date:	11 May 2020

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) — 2 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
Comment for the authors:
Where have you used "correlation coefficients were used to analyze the data and correlation coefficients were used to analyze the data"?
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 11 Sep 2019

Dear EIC,
Comments for the authors:
1- It is impossible to diagnose a disorder only by using a 5 item questionnaire, without an interview and clinical assessment. dissatisfaction and symptom are not equivalent to disorder; thus changing the title of the manuscript to " prevalence of Body dysmorphic symptoms and ....." suggested.
2- The abstract and the text of the article need to be edited.
3- The results must be organized and discussed due to research objectives.

4- Please include the main variables, in the background and discussion sections of the manuscript.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0)

11 Sep 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 (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.

Reviewers' comments

Reviewer 2:

It was amended. Indeed, we did not used the correlation coefficients. Page 2, methods, highlighted section.

Associate Editor's comments 1

Associate editor 1

1. As the reviewer suggested body dysmorphic disorder was changed to body dysmorphic symptoms in title, abstract, and the manuscript.

2. Abstract and the text of article were edited.

3. Results was organized and discussed in terms of research objectives-page 4

4.The main variables were included in background, and discussion-page 1 and 5

Answers to reviewer commented on the manuscript file

Abstract

The statistical population, sample and sampling were mentioned in abstract

Method was described in more details

Statistical methods were added

Conclusion section was included in abstract

Background

Background was revised in terms of specification as the reviewer suggested

The importance of study was added-page 2-the end of background

Results

The findings were completed

Reference was revised based on the Journal format

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) 11 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
The subject of the article is interesting generally. But it needs to be strengthened in two ways:
1. To strengthen the research background, it is recommended to use several new and valid articles in 2018 and 2019. This helps to improve the conclusion.
2. The statistical part of the research could have been reported stronger. The statistical part is considered as the main part of the research of the present study. Therefore, it is not appropriate in this article to stop this amount of analysis.
This article is also expected to have one or two highlights.
Thanks.

Nour mohammad Bakhshani: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 1 Jan 2020

Dear EIC,
Considering reviewers comments and the content of the manuscript:
- Background and the topic need to be strengthened by providing more information and recent research results.
Thanks.

Alireza Bakhshipour: EIC | **Revision** (1) 4 Jan 2020

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.

Replies to Reviewers' comments

Reviewers 1

The SPSS software was removed from the text as the reviewer suggested.

Reviewer 2

1-Several recent articles were added as the reviewer suggested. Introduction and discussion, highlighted section

2. The statistical part of the research was reported stronger as the reviewers suggested.

3. The important findings of this research has been highlighted.

Associate editor

More recent articles were added into this manuscript to strengthen the background and the topic as the associate editor suggested. – Page 1, introduction, the Highlighted section-yellow color

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.

Hasan sadeghi: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 29 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
Comments are being considered.
With the opinion of the editor, is acceptable for publication.
All bests.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 9 May 2020

Dear EIC,
Based on reviewers comments the manuscript after corrections is suggested for publishment.
Thanks.

Alireza Bakhshipour: EIC | **Revision** (2) 11 May 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.