

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>



International Journal of Sport Studies for Health

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5812/intjssh.122504>

Published in: International Journal of Sport Studies for Health: 4(2); e122504

Peer Review Report for "The Effects of Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy (CBT) in Well-Being and Perceived Stress in Adolescents with Low Academic Performance During the COVID-19 Pandemic"

Author(s): Nasim Shahrokhian, Saeid Hassanzadeh, Hadi Hashemi Razini, Maryam Ramshini

Review Timeline:

| | |
|------------------|-------------|
| ▶ Submit Date: | 24 Jan 2022 |
| ▶ Revised Date: | 6 Mar 2022 |
| ▶ Accepted Date: | 11 Mar 2022 |

Revision (0)

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

Khaled Trabelsi: Reviewer | Revision (0)

28 Jan 2022

Dear AE

There are some comments which should be addressed by the author(s):


The aim of this study was to determine whether cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT) affects well-being and perceived stress in adolescents with low academic performance during the COVID-19 pandemic.

The manuscript is well written. However, I have a few comments:

1) In the introduction section, the authors should delete the following sentence: "Given the various challenges posed by the spread of COVID-19 in the world (e.g., physical and psychological disorders), and also the lack of study in this field, it's necessary to conduct such a study. "

2) What about the sample size? Why the required sample size was not a priori calculated? I think that this step is important before starting the experimental protocol

- 3) For the Data analysis, was the normality was verified prior to statistical analysis?
 - 4) the effect size calculation should be performed and the 95% CI must be added
 - 5) sometimes, the authors used CBT and sometimes Behavioral cognitive therapy. See the conclusion section. The authors should use the abbreviation
- In general, the authors should work on the manuscript prior to its acceptance

 **Maghsoud Nabilpour:** Associate Editor | **Revision (0)**

8 Feb 2022

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 minor revision.

Kind regards

 **Morteza Taheri:** EIC | **Revision (0)**

12 Feb 2022

Dear Author,

The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to the 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.

1) In the introduction section, the authors should delete the following sentence: "Given the various challenges posed by the spread of COVID-19 in the world (e.g., physical and psychological disorders), and also the lack of study in this field, it's necessary to conduct such a study. "

-Yes, it has been deleted.

2) What about the sample size? Why the required sample size was not a priori calculated? I think that this step is important before starting the experimental protocol

-The sample size has been calculated.

3) For the Data analysis, was the normality was verified prior to statistical analysis?

-Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to normalize the data. It has mentioned in the article.

4) the effect size calculation should be performed and the 95% CI must be added

-In the analysis of variance test with repeated measures, the effect size is reported by Partial Eta Squared that effect sizes, there are in the analysis table.

5) sometimes, the authors used CBT and sometimes Behavioral cognitive therapy. see conclusion section. The authors should use the abbreviation

-Yes, cognitive behavioral therapy has changed to CBT.

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.

 **Morteza Taheri:** EIC | Revision (1)

11 Mar 2022

Dear Author,

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

Thanks