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.108121
Published in: Health Scope: 9(4); e108121

Peer Review Report for "Using Compensating Variation to Measure the Costs of Taxing Cigarette in Iran"

Author(s): Behzad Raei, Amirhossein Takian , Mehdi Yaseri, Ghahreman Abdoli, Sara Emamgholipour

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 9 Aug 2020
Revised Date: 20 Oct 2020
Accepted Date: 29 Oct 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 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
1- The investigators must clearly identify the application of this study at the end of introduction.
2- The authors should point to the sample size of the study.
3- The method of statistical analysis will be fully explained.
4- Ethical consideration is not clear in this study.
5- The authors have mentioned the unnecessary formulas and calculations in the manuscript. However, the discussion should be written about the application of the study ,especially in Iran.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 25 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript needs major revision as follows:
1. It seems that the Abstract section needs to be revised. In the Background & Objectives, only the purpose of the study is stated. Also, the type of the study and data analysis

software is not mentioned in the Methods.
2. The type of study should be added to the Materials and Methods section.
3. The type of study should be added to the Materials and Methods section.
4. It is better to move Table 1 to the Results section.
5. It is better to transfer the first paragraph of the Results section and Welfare analysis to the Materials and Methods section.
6. How short-run and long-run welfare losses are calculated?
7. When an acronym is mentioned in the paper, the acronym must be preceded by the full phrase for the first time. This is not considered for LAIDS and FCTC in 187 and 255 lines, respectively.
8. What are the practical recommendations for health policymakers and decision-makers regarding the results of this study?
9. The manuscript has grammatical errors. It should be edited by an English-language person.
Best Regards

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

Dear AE,
Thanks for this valuable work, but I think the article needs a few changes to make it better.
1. English editing is needed.Some sentences have grammatical errors and the first word of sentences should be written in large letters.
2. They should explain more about your statistical analysis.
3. Which analysis do the authors use to analyze your data? they should explain it at the end of the method part.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 13 Sep 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) 24 Sep 2020

Dear Author,
According to reviewers' comments, the manuscript requires “Major revision”.
Best Regards

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 editor,

We would like to thank the reviewers for their valuable comments. In the following table, we have tried to answer and revise the manuscript according to comments.

Reviewer 1	Authors' reply
1. It seems that Abstract section needs to be revised. In the Background & Objectives, only the purpose of the study is stated. Also, the type of the study and data analysis software are not mentioned in the Methods.	The importance of doing the study was added at the beginning of the Abstract section in brief. The software used for data analysis was mentioned.
2. The type of study should be added to the Materials and Methods section.	It was revised.
The type of study should be added to the .3 .Materials and Methods section	It was checked.
4. It is better to move Table 1 to the Results section.	Table 1 was moved to Result section, in page 5 and highlighted.
5. It is better to transfer the first paragraph of the Results section and Welfare analysis to the Materials and Methods section.	It was revised and moved in pages 5,6 and also highlighted.
6. How short-run and long-run welfare losses are calculated?	Using second-order Taylor-series expansion and Shephard's lemma on Equation 11 in the manuscript, the long- run welfare effect of price changes on consumers is calculated. On the other hand, using the first-order Taylor estimate, it is possible to obtain the short-run (immediate) effect of a variable price by assuming zero elasticity. Our estimation was sourced from a previously published study (1). This paper used first and second order Taylor approximation to measure static (without substitution in goods) and dynamic (with substitution in goods) and welfare effects of real food prices changes for all households. In the words, in the short-run it is assumed the quantity of demand is invariant while in long-run the smokers might reduce the quantity of demand in response to the price increase and substitute other commodities for cigarette.
7. When an acronym is mentioned in the paper, the acronym must be preceded by the full phrase for the first time. This is not considered for LAIDS and FCTC in 187 and	It was revised.

255 lines, respectively.	
8 .What are the practical recommendations for health policy makers and decision makers regarding the results of this study?	As suggested by the reviewer, we reviewed and added policy recommendations into “Discussion and conclusion” section, as shown in the revised version.
9. The manuscript has grammatical errors. It should be edited by an English-language person.	It was revised.
Reviewer 2	**Author reply**
1 .The investigators must clearly mention the application of this study at the end of introduction.	The application of this study in practice was provided at the end of Introduction section, in page 2.
2. The authors should point to the sample size of the study.	It was somehow revised, but since the authors have not conducted sampling and only extracted the collected data on household characteristics by Statistical Center of Iran (SCI), we only sufficed to offer possible explanation concerning how sample households are selected based on SCI approach in the revised manuscript in Method section in page 3.
3. The method of statistical analysis should be fully explained.	Econometric analysis applied to estimate the demand system for 6 groups of goods was described in more detail in Method section (Estimation). Since the estimated parameters have no direct interpretation, we represented only the calculated cigarette price elasticity. Also, the result of some statistical analysis has been shown in Table 7.
4. Ethical consideration is not clear in this study.	Ethical consideration was added, in page 15 – highlighted.
5. The authors have mentioned the unnecessary formulas and calculations in this manuscript. However, the discussion should be written based on the application of this study especially in Iran.	As suggested by the reviewer, we have reviewed carefully 'Discussion' and some paragraph was shortened with the elimination of redundancies, and revised by Iranian policy context as shown in the revised version.
Reviewer 3	**Author reply**
1. English editing is needed. Some sentences have grammatical errors and the	We agree with the reviewer’s assessment. Accordingly,

first word of sentences should be written in large letters.	throughout the manuscript, we have revised the manuscript and rectified the errors as far as possible.
2. You need to explain more about your statistical analysis.	Econometric analysis applied to estimate the demand system for 6 groups of goods, described in more detail in Method section (Estimation).
3 Which analysis do you use to analyze your data? You should explain about it at the end of method part.	It was revised, on page 5. Based on model specifications, a LA-AIDS model of the Iranian demand of 6 categories of commodities including cigarette was estimated. The details of regression model have been given in Method section.

We hope the revised manuscript will be better for the Journal of *Health Scope* and we are happy to consider further revisions, and we thank you for your continued interest in our research.
Yours Sincerely,

1. Kane GQ, Mabah Tene GL, Ambagna JJ, Piot-Lepetit I, Sikod F. The impact of food price volatility on consumer welfare in Cameroon: WIDER Working Paper; 2015. Report No.: 929230898X Contract No.: Document Number|.

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) 11 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
The authors have revised the manuscript based on the reviewers' comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 12 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
My comments have been corrected , and I think this article can be accepted for this journal.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 12 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript needs minor revision as follows:
1. The number of tables and their order should be reviewed.
2. The type of study should be added in the Materials and Methods section.
Best Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 12 Oct 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) 17 Oct 2020

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.

Dear editor,

We want to thank the reviewers for the valuable comments. In the following table, we have tried to answer and revise the manuscript according to the comments.

Reviewer 1	Authors' reply
1 *The number of tables and their order should be reviewed.*	It was checked and the tables were arranged, pages 12, 13, 14, and 15 respectively.
2. *The type of study should be added in the Materials and Methods section.*	It was revised and added, page 4 and highlighted.

We hope the revised manuscript will be better for the Journal of *Health Scope* and we are happy to consider further revisions, and we thank you for your continued interest in our research.

Yours Sincerely,

Behzad Raei,
PhD Candidate in Health Economics,
Tehran University of Medical Science, Tehran, Iran

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.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 20 Oct 2020

Dear EIC,
The decision is to accept the manuscript for publication in the journal.
Best Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 29 Oct 2020

Dear Author,
The decision is to accept this manuscript for publication in the journal.
Best Regards