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: 10.5812/jhealthscope.110707
Published in: Health Scope: 10(1); e110707

Peer Review Report for "Blood Pressure Screening Campaign in the Adult Population"

Author(s): Seyed Farzad Jalali, Mostafa Javanian, Reza Ghadimi, Ali Bijani, Simin Mouodi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 27 Oct 2020
Revised Date: 30 Nov 2020
Accepted Date: 19 Dec 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) — 17 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
Except a few grammatical problems, which remain in PDF as comments, there is no technical problem with the article.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 26 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1- The first sentence of the conclusion in the abstract belongs to the result, not to the conclusion section.
2- The method for sample size and sampling is not clear
3- In table 1, the researchers have done four statistical tests for each independent variable, but they have reported only one p value. Please review and explain.
4- It seems that there are several comparison issues in this analysis. What is the explanation?
5- In Table 2, you must specify which variables are set.

6- The Conclusion is not complete and related to the all results of this study.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 26 Nov 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** (0) 27 Nov 2020

Dear Author
According to reviewer comments, the manuscript need “Minor 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 Prof. Ramazan Mirzaei

Editor-in-Chief

Health Scope Journal

Thanks for your email about our manuscript entitled as "Blood pressure screening campaign in adult population" with article ID: 110707.

All of recommended points have been considered in the revised article. Changes have been highlighted in yellow.

The comments and the answers are being summarized in the table below.

Dear reviewers' comments	Answer
The first sentence of conclusion in the abstract belongs to result and not conclusion.	This sentence has been changed according to dear reviewer's comment.
The method for sample size and sampling is not clear.	More details about the study population has been mentioned in "Method" section.
In table 1, the researchers have done 4 statistical tests for each independent variables, but they have reported only one p value. Please revised and explain.	Thanks. It has been provided in Table 1.
It seems there is multiple comparison issue in this analysis. What is the explain?	Since the inclusion of more data on blood pressure measurements could be useful for future studies, especially for secondary studies and meta-analyzes, other characteristics such as mean arterial pressure and pulse pressure were measured and reported in the manuscript, in addition to systolic and diastolic blood pressure.
In table 2 should specify exactly which variables were adjusted for.	All the four mentioned characteristics (including age, gender, living location and marital status) have been entered in logistic regression analysis.
The Conclusion is not complete and related to the all results of this study.	It has been changed according to dear reviewer's comment.
Below you can find the list of files attached by reviewers or associate editor or EIC during the review process.	No file has been attached.

Thanks for your consideration

Simin Mouodi. MD, MPH, PhD

Assistant Professor of Research in Clinical Sciences

Corresponding Author

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 11 Dec 2020

Dear EIC,
The authors have revised the manuscript based on the reviewer's comments.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 19 Dec 2020

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