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.106801
Published in: Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research: 18(4); e106801

Peer Review Report for "An Investigation of Natural Background Radiation and Health Risk Assessment in Kohgiluyeh and Boyer-Ahmad Province, Iran"

Author(s): Mahmoud Bagheri, Mohammad Reza Fouladi, Razzagh Abedi-Firouzjah

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 5 Jul 2020
Revised Date: 22 Nov 2020
Accepted Date: 26 Nov 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 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
- The overall quality is suitable for inclusion in this journal
- The English and syntax of the paper are satisfactory.
- The abstract is sufficiently concise of the contents of the paper
- The research paper doesn't provide or illustrate novelty and it doesn't make an original contribution to knowledge, but it has practical application in a special province.
- Write the experiment site (Kohgiluyeh and Boyer-Ahmad Province, Iran) in the title as the similar papers do in your references.
- It is better to write the abbreviation journals' names in references.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 31 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
I read this manuscript and there are some comments as below:
1- The method for analyzing the data was not mentioned.
2- Some references need to write in abbreviation style.

3- The majority of references were old and It is suggested that add some new and recent references.
4- Some parts at the end of the manuscript like Conflict of Interest and so on were not mentioned.
Totally this manuscript needs minor revision and after that, the publication of this will be suggested.
Best Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 31 Oct 2020

Dear EIC,
According to the comments of reviewers, this manuscript needs minor revision and there were some errors in some parts like annalizing method, references, and so on.
Best Regards

Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah: EIC | **Revision** (0) 3 Nov 2020

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.

Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research

Dear Prof. Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah

The authors wish to express our thanks to the editor and reviewers of this honorable journal, due to their very thorough review of the paper. We have incorporated all of the reviewers' comments into this revised draft. It is notable that all of the changes were highlighted in the text. We hope that you find our edited manuscript acceptable.

Reviewer 1:
- The overall quality is suitable for inclusion in this journal
- The English and syntax of the paper is satisfactory.
- The abstract is sufficiently concise of the contents of the paper
- The research paper doesn't provide or illustrate novelty and it doesn't make an original contribution to knowledge, but it has practical application in special province.

Answer: Dear reviewer, the authors would like to appreciate for your valuable comments and suggestions.

Here are my comments:
- Write the experiment site (Kohgiluyeh and Boyer-Ahmad province, Iran) in the title as the similar papers does in your references.

Answer: The name of the province was written in the title of the new version.

- It is better to write the abbreviation journals name's in references.

Answer: The relevant corrections have been carried out in the reference section.

Reviewer 2:
Dear AE
I read this manuscript and there are some comments as below:

1- The method for analyzing the data was not mentioned.

Answer: The method section for analyzing was added in the text. Thanks for your consideration.

2- Some references needs to write in abbreviation style.

Answer: Following your suggestion the abbreviation of some references have been written in the new version.

3- The majority of references were old and It is suggested that add some new and recent references.

Answer: In the new version, we have tried to update the old references. As we wanted to compare the background dose values with some cities, and the measurements may not be updated. For this reason we are not able to change those references.

4- Some parts at the end of manuscript like Conflict of Interest and so on were not mentioned.

Answer: Some parts were added in the Footnotes section.

Totally this manuscript needs to minor revision and after that, the publication of this will be suggested.
Best Regards
Minoo Shaddel (Rviewer)

We would like to appreciate for dedicating your worth time and comments.

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) 17 Nov 2020

Dear Author,

1. References are still not in journal format. For example, reference 30, only the first author is identified, and in many references, the full journal name is written, which should be the abbreviation of the journal.

2. Conclusions must be limited to research results.

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.

Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research

Dear Prof. Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah

The authors wish to express our thanks to the editor due to the very thorough review of the paper. The changes were highlighted in the text.

Comments:

1. References are still not in journal format. For example, reference 30, only the first author is identified, and in many references, the full journal name is written, which should be the abbreviation of the journal.

Answer: Thanks a lot for your consideration. In this version, we have tried to edit whole references following your journal format.

2. Conclusions must be limited to research results

Answer: The conclusion section in both abstract and text were revised based on the result section.

The authors would like to thank a lot for dedicating your worth time and comments to our manuscript.

With best 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.

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