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.101972
Published in: Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research: 18(2); e101972

Peer Review Report for "The Prevalence of Metabolic Syndrome in Iranian Firefighters"

Author(s): Farzaneh Montazerifar, Mansour Karajibani, Razieh Hosseini, Aliyeh Tafazzoli, Ahmad Bolouri

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 19 Feb 2020
Revised Date: 25 May 2020
Accepted Date: 26 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.

Parvin Zareian: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 11 Mar 2020

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

Zahra Sadat Asadi: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 11 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
The authors should consider these comments to improve your article:
- Note the time (year) and place of the study in the title.
- In the background: the 2nd and 3rd lines (sentences) do not support each other and somehow there is an opposition!
- Correct the objective part according to the years and places of the study.
- The sampling method should be written in the abstract.
References:
- The references need to be updated.
Method:
- “cigarette smoking”: why this factor is one of the inclusion criteria? This item might affect the results!!!!

- What are the exclusion criteria?
- The sample size formula should be written.
Results:
- There are employees with 16 years old ??? the age range is 16- 55!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision (0)** 13 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
In this paper, the Prevalence of Metabolic Syndrome in Iranian Firefighters was investigated. In my opinion, the manuscript is suitable for publication in the Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research. The introduction provides a good, generalized background of the topic. Statistical design and analysis is appropriate. This study has an in-depth discussion. The English language style, grammar and spelling are acceptable without plagiarism.
Thanks.

Parvin Zareian: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 17 Apr 2020

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,

Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah: EIC | **Revision (0)** 27 Apr 2020

Dear Author,
Article Standard: Not OK
- The blindness of Peer Review: To ensure that article referees or peer reviewers do not know your identity (as author[s] of the manuscript being reviewed), those files (i.e., Full Manuscript File; Reply to Reviewers, Appendices, Figures, Abstract) that reviewers can see, should not contain author names or affiliations.
- Authors should obtain written Informed Consent signed by the study participants or patients and should upload a copy of the Informed Consent form on the journal website. Informed consent and other ethical considerations should be mentioned on the journal website or in the text of the manuscript. * Please write meaningful and complete sentences and do not use ambiguous phrases such as "No" or "None Declared".
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.

To,

Editor–in-Chief : **Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research**

Subject: **Revised manuscript ID: 101972**

Dear Sir,

We highly appreciate the valuable comments of the referees on the manuscript ID: **101972 ;** entitled "**The Prevalence of Metabolic Syndrome in Iranian Firefighters "** .We revised the manuscript according to the honorable editor comments and all corrections have been pointed by red color in the text.

Answer to query

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Dear authors consider these comments to improve your article:
*- Note the time **(year)** and **place** of the study **in the title**.*

Answer: Done

In the background: the 2nd and 3rd lines (sentences) do not support each other and somehow there is an opposition!

Answer: **It is correct. Because Metabolic syndrome (MetS) is characterized by dyslipidemia, abdominal obesity, high fasting blood sugar and hypertension. Thus, I don't understand where the problem is. Would you please guide me more clearly?**

Correct the objective part according to the years and places of the study.

Answer: Done

*The **sampling method** should be written in the **abstract.***

Answer: Done

References:

The references need to be updated.

Answer: Done

- Method:

"cigarette smoking": why this factor is one of the inclusion criteria? This item might affect the results!!!!

Answer I'm so sorry. Cigarette smoking is in exclusion criteria. It was corrected.

What are the exclusion criteria?

Answer: *It has been written after inclusion criteria, in the 4th to 6th lines.*

Inclusion criteria included at least 2 years of full time employment as a firefighter with no history of underlying diseases such as hypertension, kidney failure, hypo / hyperthyroidism and liver diseases, known cardiovascular disease, diabetes mellitus and **cigarette smoking.**

The sample size formula should be written.

Answer: Since, the samples were selected by census method, all firefighters working in the fire department of Zahedan city were included in this study. Therefore, there is no need to the sample size formula.

Results:

there are employees with 16 years old ??? the age range is 16- 55!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Answer: It is corrected.

Reviewer 2:

no comment

Reviewer 3:

In this paper the Prevalence of Metabolic Syndrome in Iranian Firefighters was investigated. In my opinion, the manuscript is suitable for publication in Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research. The introduction provides a good, generalized background of the topic. Statistical design and analysis is appropriate. This study has an in-depth discussion. The English language style, grammar and spelling are acceptable without plagiarism.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

no comment

EIC Decision:

Article Standard: Not OK
- The blindness of Peer Review: To ensure that article referees or peer reviewers do not know your identity (as author[s] of the manuscript being reviewed), those files (i.e., Full Manuscript File; Reply to Reviewers, Appendices, Figures, Abstract) that reviewers can see, should not contain author names or affiliations.

-Authors should obtain written Informed Consent signed by the study participants or patients and should upload a copy of ***the Informed Consent form on the journal website****.*
Informed consent and other ethical considerations should be mentioned on the journal website or ***in the text of the manuscript****.*

Answer : The sentence regarding the Informed consent has been written in Methods in the 6th to 8th lines as follows:

The protocol of study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Zahedan University of Medical Sciences (Code No: IR.ZAUMS.REC. 1396.2). An oral informed consent was also obtained from all participants.

** Please write meaningful and complete sentences and do not use ambiguous phrases such as "No" or "None Declared".*

Answer: Done

Conflict of Interest: The authors have no competing interests.

We hope that the response to the comments of the honorable referees is satisfactory.
Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Farzaneh Montazerifar , PhD.

Associate Professor of Nutrition
Dept. of Nutrition, School of Medicine,
Zahedan University of Medical Sciences,
Zahedan, Iran.

E-mail - fmontazerifar@gmail.com

Tel: +98- 9155416903 Fax: +98- 541-33295728

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) 5 May 2020

Dear Author,

1. Abstract: delete “The aim of this study was to determine the prevalence of MetS among Zahedan city firefighters, Iran.” From background. What is your mean MS in conclusion?
2. In the text: references are not in journal format.
3. Most references are not written accurately and must be revised.
4. Delete result of total result column and Mean ±SD row from Table 1.
5. Delete n(%)row from Table 2 and Table 3.

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.

To,

Editor–in-Chief: **Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research**

Subject: **Revised manuscript ID: 101972**

Dear Prof. Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah ,

We highly appreciate the valuable comments of the referees on the manuscript ID: **101972;** entitled "**The Prevalence of Metabolic Syndrome in Iranian Firefighters"** .We revised the manuscript according to the honorable editor comments and all corrections have been pointed by red color in the text.

Reviewers' Comments and Answer to query

EIC Decision

1. Abstract: delete "The aim of this study was to determine the prevalence of MetS among Zahedan city firefighters, Iran." From background. Done
2. What is your mean MS in conclusion? MetS

2. In the text: references are not in journal format. It was corrected

3. Most references are not written accurately and must be revised. Done

4. delete result of total result column and Mean ±SD row from Table 1. Done

5. delete n(%)row from Table 2 and Table 3. Done

We hope that the response to the comments of the honorable referees is satisfactory.
Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Farzaneh Montazerifar , PhD.

Associate Professor of Nutrition
Dept. of Nutrition, School of Medicine,
Zahedan University of Medical Sciences,
Zahedan, Iran.

E-mail - fmontazerifar@gmail.com

Tel: +98- 9155416903

Fax: +98- 541-33295728

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.

Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah: EIC | **Revision** (2) 26 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.