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

Health Scope
Article DOI: 10.5812/jhealthscope.101657
Published in: Health Scope: 9(4); e101657

Peer Review Report for "Burden of Disease Caused by Road Traffic Accidents in the City of Mashhad"

Author(s): Amin Mohammadi, Mehdi Yousefi, Ali Taghipour, Hossein Ebrahimipour, Mehdi Varmaghani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 9 Feb 2020
Revised Date: 18 May 2020
Accepted Date: 24 Jun 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) — 30 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
1- The English writing is somewhat poor
2- It is unknown that which software was used by the authors. I do not mean the excel.
3- The authors could present the DALY based on type of the RTA.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 3 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
The authors should:
- Check your Keywords with the Mesh database.
- Added in a method that, when the data was collected? Months and year?
- The authors reported “The main research instrument was a researcher-made form”, what was the study instrument, Checklist, or questionnaire? Whether it was standard? - To approve the validity of the questionnaire, the authors should have calculated the CVI and CVR.
- Which hospitals have you collected HIS information?
- Mention to inclusion and exclusion criteria in this study?

- Check the sums and percentages reported in Tables 3 and 4.
- Mention the applicable results of the study in conclusion.
Regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 11 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript needs major revision as follow:
Background
1. Paragraph 4, lines 1, 2 is ambiguous. In addition, when an acronym is mentioned in the manuscript, the acronym must be preceded by the full phrase for the first time. This is not considered for BOD.
Methods
2. Paragraph 1, line 4: There is no closing parenthesis.
3. The year of the study conducted and the year of data collection should be added to the method section.
Results
4. Paragraph 2, line 1: YLL or DALY?
5. Paragraph 3: This paragraph is supposed to talk about the “years lost due to disability”, why is it said about death?
6. Typographical error of tables title should be corrected.
7. It seems that row 18 of Table 4 needs to be revised.
Discussion
8. Paragraph 4: The content of this paragraph is inconsistent. This paragraph seems to need to be revised.
9. What are the practical recommendations for health policymakers and decision-makers regarding the results of this study?
10. Suggestions for further studies should be mentioned.
11. Conflict of interest should be added to the manuscript.
12. The manuscript has typographical errors. It should be edited by an English-speaking person.
Best regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 18 Apr 2020

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 major revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 25 Apr 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.

Thanks to the esteemed Referees, the amendments were made as follows.

Reviewer 1:
1- the English writing is somewhat poor
2- it is unknown that which software was used by the authors. I do not mean the excel.
3- the authors could present the DALY based on type of the RTA.

1- The article was corrected by a Kowsarpub.

2- We have used Excel software for calculations. The description is given in the last paragraph of the procedure section.

3- The aim of the study was not to investigate the types of accidents, such as an accident between two cars or between a car with a motorcycle or a pedestrian, etc. However, the data in this regard are not reliable.

Reviewer 2:
1- check your Keywords with Mesh data base.

2- Added in method that, when the data was collected? Months and year?

3- Authors reported "The main research instrument was a researcher-made form", what was the study instrument, Checklist or questionnaire? Whether it was standard? To approving the validly of the questionnaire, the authors should have calculated the CVI and CVR.

4- Which hospitals have you collected HIS information?

5- Mention to inclusion and exclusion criteria in this study?

6- Check the sums and percentages reported in Tables 3 and 4.
7- Mention the applicable results of the study in conclusion.

1- Keywords checked *with Mesh data base*

2- Data collection time was added to the method. (The second and third lines of the first paragraph of the method.)

3- The data collection and validation tool was modified. (The last line of the third paragraph of the method.)

4- The names of the hospitals were added to the method.)The first paragraph of the method.(

5- Inclusion and exclusion criteria were added to the study. (End of the fourth paragraph of the method)

6- Sum and percentages were checked again in Tables 3 and 4.

7- The practical result was added to the conclusion.(Fourth and fifth lines of conclusion.)

Reviewer 3:
Dear Associate Editor
The manuscript needs major revision as follow:
Background
1. Paragraph 4, lines 1, 2 is ambiguous. In addition, when an acronym is mentioned in the manuscript, the acronym must be preceded by the full phrase for the first time. This is not considered for BOD.
Methods
2. Paragraph 1, line 4: There is no closed parenthesis.
3. The year of study conducted and the year of data collection should be added to the method section.
Results
4. Paragraph 2, line 1: YLL or DALY?
5. Paragraph 3: This paragraph is supposed to talk about the "years lost due to disability", why is it said about death?
6. Typographical error of tables title should be corrected.
7. It seems that row 18 of Table 4 needs to be revised.
Discussion
8. Paragraph 4: The content of this paragraph is inconsistent. This paragraph seems to need to be revised.
9. What are the practical recommendations for health policy makers and decision makers regarding the results of this study?
10. Suggestions for further studies should be mentioned.
11. Conflict of interest should be added to the manuscript.
12. The manuscript has typographical errors. It should be edited by an English-speaking person.

Introduction

1- Lines 1 and 2 were corrected in paragraph 4 of the introduction. The BOD abbreviated was corrected.

Method

2- The parenthesis was closed.

3- Data collection time and year of study were added to the method.

findings

4- line 1 of Paragraph 2 was corrected.

5. The typographical mistake occurred in this paragraph and was related to the word "injured" which was mistakenly used as "victim" and was corrected.

6- The titles of the tables were corrected.

7- Line 18 of Table No. 4 was checked, the calculations were checked again and there was no problem.

Discussion

8. Line 1, paragraph 8, was ambiguously and was corrected.

9. A practical recommendation for policy-making was added to the conclusion.

10. suggests was added for future studies.

11- The absence of conflicts of interest was declared.

12. The article was edited by a Kowsarpub.

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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 15 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
The authors have revised the manuscript according to reviewers' comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 20 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
¬ Check your Keywords with the Mesh data base.
¬ Determine which software and version you have used? It is necessary to analyze the results with statistical software and report the tables again. Check the sums and percentages reported in the Tables. Mistakes highlighted in the text.
¬ The Code and date of ethical approval should be mentioned in the text.
¬ Be the same number of decimals in tables.
¬ Please mention the weak and strong points of your study
Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 20 Jun 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,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 24 Jun 2020

Dear Author,
According to reviewer comments, the manuscript needs "Minor Revision".
Best Regards