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

Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research
Article DOI: 10.5812/amh.100882
Published in: Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research: 18(2); e100882

Peer Review Report for "Identifying and Evaluating the Decision-Making Styles of Patients Referring to Specialty and Subspecialty Clinics in Iran"

Author(s): Mehrdad Nasrollahzadehsabet, Mohammad Reza Gholizadeh, Mohammad Faryabi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 12 Jan 2020
Revised Date: 2 Jul 2020
Accepted Date: 7 Jul 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) — 23 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. This study needs some major revision before publishing.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 24 Feb 2020

Dear EIC,
According to the comments of reviewers, this manuscript needs major revision.
regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 5 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
This article needs major revisions.
Thanks.

Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 8 Mar 2020

Dear EIC,
The paper does not have a systematic review structure. None of the article sections is in journal format. Reference should be written in Arabic numerals and in parentheses and in order of entry. The number of words should be limited to about 3,000. References from authors need to be provided.
Thanks.

Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah: EIC | **Revision (0)** 8 Mar 2020

Dear Author,
The paper does not have a systematic review structure. None of the article sections is in journal format. Reference should be written in Arabic numerals and in parentheses and in order of entry. The number of words should be limited to about 3,000. References from authors need to be provided. Provide the manuscript as a systemic review structure.
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 Reviewers,

Thanks for your great reviews that helps us improve our work, it is much appreciated. We received your notes and did all the required changes accordingly.

Regards,

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.

Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah: EIC | **Revision** (1) 27 Apr 2020

Dear Author,
References are not in journal format. In the text, it must be cited in the order of entry. please see the guide for the author and edit it according to the journal format.
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 Reviewers,

Thanks for your great reviews that helps us improve our work, it is much appreciated. We received your notes and did all the required changes accordingly.

Regards,

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.

Rohallah Mirjani: Associate Editor | Revision (2) 13 May 2020

Dear EIC,
It seems that the article is not submitted in the correct format and the manuscript is duplicated (pages 13-21) so this is appreciated that the authors resubmit it in a correct format.
Best regards

Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah: EIC | Revision (2) 22 May 2020

Dear Author,
Please edit The references based on the journal format.
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.

Dear Reviewers,

Thanks for your great reviews that helps us improve our work, it is much appreciated. We received your notes and did all the required changes accordingly.

Regards,

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.

Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah: EIC | **Revision** (3) 7 Jul 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.