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

Health Scope
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/jhealthscope.100506
Published in: Health Scope: 11(1); e100506

Peer Review Report for "Evaluation of the External Ear and Head Anthropometric Dimensions Among Fars and Turk Workers for the Ergonomic Design of the Earmuffs"

Author(s): Ehsan Hamamizadeh, Hassan Asilian-Mahabadi, Ali Khavanin

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 1 Jan 2020
Revised Date: 16 Jan 2022
Accepted Date: 27 Jan 2022

Revision (0)

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

Zahra Naghavi-Konjin: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 31 Jan 2020

1. The language of the paper needs to be improved.
2. In the provided photos, determine the dimensions for measured points.
3. Discussion section could be improved by addressing and comparing results with some related studies such as 1. Surveying the dimensions and characteristics of Korean ears for the ergonomic design of ear-related products, 2. Measuring the External Ear for Hearing Protection Device Design and …

hamidreza mokarami: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 31 Mar 2020

This manuscript describes a study investigating the external ear and head anthropometric dimensions among Iranian workers. The topic and novelty of the manuscript are interesting and deserve considerable research to advance the literature. However, I have some concerns and comments as listed below

1. How many men and women participated in this study? It is suggested that the results be

compared with studies in western countries.
2. The results should be compared with the results of other countries. It is suggested that these results be reported in a separate table.
2. Ethical measures in research should be mentioned (documentation number from University Ethics Committee, has informed consent been used - verbal or written, and other)
3. I suggest the authors clarify the rationale for using the parametric tests. The authors may consider checking the normality of the outcome variables
4. It is suggested that the results be compared with studies in western countries (the discussion section)
5. The study limitations should be mentioned.

raheleh hashemi habybabady: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 8 Apr 2020

Dear author:
The manuscript entitled Evaluation of the external ear and head anthropometric dimensions among Fars and Turk ethnicities workers for the ergonomic design of earmuffs has been reviewed by the reviewers and the corrections are as follows:

Reviewer 1:

1. The language of the paper needs to be improved.
2. In the provided photos, determine the dimensions for measured points.
3. Discussion section could be improved by addressing and comparing results with some related studies such as 1. Surveying the dimensions and characteristics of Korean ears for the ergonomic design of ear-
2. related products, 2. Measuring the External Ear for Hearing Protection Device Design and …

Reviewer 2:

This manuscript describes a study investigating the external ear and head anthropometric dimensions among Iranian workers. The topic and novelty of the manuscript are interesting and deserve considerable research to advance the literature. However, I have some concerns and comments as listed below
1. How many men and women participated in this study? It is suggested that the results be compared with studies in western countries.
2. The results should be compared with the results of other countries. It is suggested that these results be reported in a separate table.
2. Ethical measures in research should be mentioned (documentation number from University Ethics Committee, has informed consent been used - verbal or written, and other)
3. I suggest the authors clarify the rationale for using the parametric tests. The authors may consider checking the normality of the outcome variables
4. It is suggested that the results be compared with studies in western countries (the discussion section)
5. The study limitations should be mentioned.

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (0) 13 Apr 2020

Dear author:
The manuscript entitled Evaluation of the external ear and head anthropometric dimensions among Fars and Turk ethnicities workers for the ergonomic design of earmuffs has been reviewed by the reviewers and the corrections are as follows:
Reviewer 1:
1. The language of the paper needs to be improved.
2. In the provided photos, determine the dimensions for measured points.
3. Discussion section could be improved by addressing and comparing results with some related studies such as 1. Surveying the dimensions and characteristics of Korean ears for the ergonomic design of ear-
2. related products, 2. Measuring the External Ear for Hearing Protection Device Design and …
Reviewer 2:
This manuscript describes a study investigating the external ear and head anthropometric dimensions among Iranian workers. The topic and novelty of the manuscript are interesting and deserve considerable research to advance the literature. However, I have some concerns and comments as listed below
1. How many men and women participated in this study? It is suggested that the results be compared with studies in western countries.
2. The results should be compared with the results of other countries. It is suggested that these results be reported in a separate table.
2. Ethical measures in research should be mentioned (documentation number from University Ethics Committee, has informed consent been used - verbal or written, and other)
3. I suggest the authors clarify the rationale for using the parametric tests. The authors may consider checking the normality of the outcome variables
4. It is suggested that the results be compared with studies in western countries (the discussion section)
5. The study limitations should be mentioned.
best

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.

Response to reviewers

January 14, 2022

Title: Evaluation of the external ear and head anthropometric dimensions among Fars and Turk workers for the ergonomic design of the earmuffs.

Dear Prof. Ramazan Mirzaei
The Editor of the journal of Health Scope

We would appreciate all the valuable comments and suggestions from the esteemed reviewers and editor. We have adopted all the comments and suggestions in the revised manuscript. The following are our point-to-point responses to the comments.

Reviewer #1

Comment #1:

1. page 4, line 74: West Azerbaijan repeated twice times…highlighted with violet

Answer

1) Instead of East Azerbaijan, West Azerbaijan was repeated, which was corrected in the revised version.

Comment #2:

2. Page 5, line 91: before measuring of …..

Answer

2. Thank you for this comment. The grammatical errors have been corrected in the revised version.

Comment #3:

3. Page 6, line 125: no need for parentheses for tables 4 and 5: is shown in tables 4 and 5

Answer

3. The parentheses were removed.

Comment #4:

4. Page 6, line 132: replace the word “for” with the word “by”

Answer

1) The grammatical errors have been corrected in the revised version.

Comment #5:

5. Page 12, line 293: Table 1: please add the word “Comparing” in the table title

Answer

5) Thank you for your comments. The title of Table 1 has been corrected.

.

Reviewer #2

The authors have done a very thorough job of addressing the reviewers’ comments on the previous version of this manuscript. It is now much more informative for the Health scope audience, with much of the overly technical material, removed and replaced with a more general description and explanation.

Answer

Thank you for the remarks and comments.

We wish the revised manuscript could fulfill all of the requirements mentioned by an esteemed editor.

Sincerely yours,

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.

Zahra Naghavi Konjin: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 14 Dec 2021

Dear Editor

This paper could be accepted with minor revisions. The authors need to consider the following corrections:

page 4, line 74: West Azerbaijan repeated twice times…highlighted with violet

Page 5, line 91: before measuring of …..

Page 6, line 125: no need for parentheses for tables 4 and 5: is shown in tables 4 and 5

Page 6, line 132: replace the word “for” with the word “by”

Page 12, line 293: Table 1: please add the word “Comparing” in the table title

required corrections highlighted with violet color in the attached file

Best Regards

hamidreza mokarami: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 16 Dec 2021

The authors have done a very thorough job of addressing the reviewers’ comments on the previous version of this manuscript. It is now much more informative for the Health scope audience, with much of the overly technical material, removed and replaced with a more general description and explanation.

raheleh hashemi habybabady: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 26 Dec 2021

Dear Author: manuscript entitled“Evaluation of the external ear and head anthropometric dimensions among Fars and Turk workers for the ergonomic design of the earmuffs has been evaluated and the following minor revisions are recommended:

Reviewer 1:
Dear Editor

This paper could be accepted with minor revisions. The authors need to consider the following corrections:

page 4, line 74: West Azerbaijan repeated twice times…highlighted with violet

Page 5, line 91: before measuring of …..
Page 6, line 125: no need for parentheses for tables 4 and 5: is shown in tables 4 and 5
Page 6, line 132: replace the word “for” with the word “by”
Page 12, line 293: Table 1: please add the word “Comparing” in the table title
required corrections highlighted with violet color in the attached file

Best Regards
Reviewer 2:
The authors have done a very thorough job of addressing the reviewers’ comments on the previous version of this manuscript. It is now much more informative for the Health scope audience, with much of the overly technical material, removed and replaced with a more general description and explanation.

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (1) 31 Dec 2021

Dear Author

According to reviewer comments, the manuscript needs “Minor revision”.
Best Regards

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.

Response to reviewers

November 11, 2021

Title: Evaluation of the external ear and head anthropometric dimensions among Fars and Turk workers for the ergonomic design of the earmuffs.

Dear Prof. Ramazan Mirzaei
The Editor of the journal of Health Scope

We would appreciate all the valuable comments and suggestions from the esteemed reviewers and editor. We have adopted all the comments and suggestions in the revised manuscript. The following are our point-to-point responses to the comments.

Reviewer #1

Comment #1:

1. The language of the paper needs to be improved.

Answer

1) Native editing was done.

Comment #2:

2. In the provided photos, determine the dimensions for measured points.

Answer

2. Thank you for this comment. Dimensions of measured points were added to the photos in the new version of the manuscript.

Comment #3:

3. Discussion section could be improved by addressing and comparing results with some related studies such as 1. Surveying the dimensions and characteristics of Korean ears for the ergonomic design of ear-related products, 2. Measuring the External Ear for Hearing Protection Device Design and …

Answer

Thank you for your comments, which have helped us to substantially improve the manuscript. The discussion section was rewritten and the points you wanted were considered.

Reviewer #2

Comment #1:

1. How many men and women participated in this study? It is suggested that the results be compared with studies in western countries.

Answer

1) In this study, 300 Iranian male workers (20-60 years) from two Fars (n=150) and Turk (n=150) ethnicity groups working in factories in Tehran province were studied.

Comment #2:

2. The results should be compared with the results of other countries. It is suggested that these results be reported in a separate table.

Answer

2) Thank you for this comment. The results of this study were compared with the results of studies of other researchers from different countries in the discussion section.

Comment #3:

3. Ethical measures in research should be mentioned (documentation number from University Ethics Committee, has informed consent been used - verbal or written, and other)

Answer

3. Number from University Ethics Committee is **((**IR.TMU.REC.1396.696)), which is mentioned in the ((Ethical Approval)) section. Details about consent were added in the method section.

Comment #4:

4. I suggest the authors clarify the rationale for using the parametric tests. The authors may consider checking the normality of the outcome variables

Answer

4) Thank you for your comments. Data based on the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test were normally distributed. Therefore, parametric tests were used

Comment #5:

5. It is suggested that the results be compared with studies in western countries (the discussion section)

Answer

4) We appreciate this comment. The results of this study were compared with the results of studies of other researchers from different countries in the discussion section.

Comment #6:

6. The study limitations should be mentioned.

Answer

5) Thank you for your comments. No limitations were observed in this study.

We wish the revised manuscript could fulfill all of the requirements mentioned by an esteemed editor.

Sincerely yours,

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.

raheleh hashemi habybabady: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 25 Jan 2022

Dear author

I would like to suggest this article be published

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (2) 27 Jan 2022

Dear Author

According to reviewer comments, Your article has been accepted for publication
Best Regards