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.108482
Published in: Health Scope: 10(1); e108482

Peer Review Report for "The Medical Tourism Industry in Iran: A Review of Websites Designed for Cross-border Patients"

Author(s): Abdolvahab Baghbanian, Reza Safdari, Leila Erfannia, Mojtaba Zokaee

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 12 Aug 2020
Revised Date: 31 Jan 2021
Accepted Date: 5 Feb 2021

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) — 6 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1- There is a need to update of years in the manuscript, some of the article statistics related to last years and may be changed over the years, such as statistics represented on Page 4, paragraphs 2, 3, …
2- Please add some other research in this subject area in the discussion section, so that this paper will be compared with other research.
3- Add a paragraph about the future direction of research.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 15 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript entitle: The Medical Tourism Industry in Iran: A Review of Websites Designed for Cross-border Patients" has reviewed an important issue in Iranian health system. In my opinion it could be review and publish as a "short communication". Also, the following comment should be done:
- write introduction shorter

- describe more about self-administered checklist and its validity.
- explain more about 12 website detail.
- kindly write the implications of study
- Table 1. The first two variables are the same. Check it.
- Write date of the study in method.
- Write conclusion of the study with sharp message for managers

Best.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 15 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 reviewer comments, the manuscript needs “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-in-charge

Thank you for your valuable comments on the manuscript 108482 entitled “The Medical Tourism Industry in Iran: A Review of Websites Designed for Cross-border Patients”.

Below, we explain how the issues/concerns raised by the reviewers have been addressed:

Reviewer 1	
Comments made	**Responses/Amendment(s)**
write introduction shorter	As requested, the introduction was amended and shortened.
Describe more about self-administered checklist and its validity.	A revision has been made to address this comment.
Explain more about 12 website detail.	A revision has been made to address this comment.
kindly write the implications of study	A revision has been made to address this comment.
Table 1, the first two variables are the same. Check it.	Both variables have been checked and written correctly but synonyms were applied because the two terms “specialist” AND “speciality” look similar.
Write date of the study in method.	The study date was included and updated in the method section because of an error found in the text.
Write conclusion of the study with sharp message for managers	A revision has been made to accommodate a brief conclusion in the text (last paragraph). Thank you
Reviewer 2	
There is a need to update of years in the manuscript, some of the statistics in the article are related to last years and may be changed over the years, such as statistics represented in Page 4, paragraph 2, 3, …	Attempts were made to update the figures/statistics in the manuscript. However, at times, we were unable to find the most recent data for 2019 or 2020.
Please add some other research in this subject area in the discussion section, to comparison this paper results with other researches.	To the best of our knowledge, very few similar studies were found to help us compare the results. As such we didn't have any other choices. Also, apparently, our manuscript has been chosen as a short communication, and therefore we must be mindful of the word limit. We had to reduce the number of words from 6670 to around 3800 words including references and tables.
Please add one paragraph regarding the future direction of research.	The future direction of the research was acknowledged within the discussion section. Thank you

Once again, thank you for your time and consideration, and please let us know if you need more clarification.

Best Regards

Vahab Baghbanian

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) — 4 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
The previous comments were done appropriately. Yet, the manuscript should be revised based on the following comments in the final review.
- Change the type of the manuscript to Brief Report.
- Kindly write a structured abstract. See published papers in the journal.
- Introduction section is long for a brief report. Write shorter in three paragraphs.
- Indicate ethical considerations and ethical code in the method section.
- Kindly write the conclusion section. Note, conclusion and discussion sections should be written separately.
Best.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 6 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs Minor Revision.
Best,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 10 Jan 2021

Dear Author
According to reviewer comments, the manuscript need “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-in-charge

Thank you for your valuable comments on the manuscript 108482 entitled “The Medical Tourism Industry in Iran: A Review of Websites Designed for Cross-border Patients”.

Below, we explain how the issues/concerns raised by the reviewers have been addressed:

Reviewers’ Comments	
Comments made	**Responses/Amendment(s)**
Change the type of the manuscript to Brief Report.	As requested, the ‘manuscript type’ was changed within the online portal.
Kindly write a structured abstract. See to published papers in the journal.	As requested, the format of the abstract was revised within the online portal.
Introduction section is long for a brief report. Write shorter in three paragraphs.	The length of the introduction section was shortened as much as possible.
Indicate ethical considerations and ethical code in method section	Revised and yellow-highlighted in the manuscript as follows: “Ethics approval was not required for this study, as it was based on the analysis of existing text without human involvement, and data was obtained anonymously from the selected websites.”
Kindly write conclusion section. Note, conclusion and discussion sections should be written separately.	Done as requested.

Once again, thank you for your time and consideration, and please let us know if you need more clarification.

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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 1 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
The manuscript entitled The Medical Tourism Industry in Iran: A Review of Websites Designed for Cross-border Patients" was revised based on the previous comments. It could be published in the journal.
Best,

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 1 Feb 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript entitle: The Medical Tourism Industry in Iran: A Review of Websites Designed for Cross-border Patients" was revised based on the Reviewer's comments. It can be published in the journal.
Regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 5 Feb 2021

Dear Author
Your article has been accepted for publication.
Best regards