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.111545
Published in: Health Scope: 10(3); e111545

Peer Review Report for "Iranian Healthcare System and Raising Wave of Privatization: A Literature Review"

Author(s): Sharareh Akhavan

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 1 Dec 2020
Revised Date: 28 Apr 2021
Accepted Date: 10 May 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) 29 Dec 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
- The Title is not suitable for study and is very ambiguous.
- In the abstract: Mention the Time period of search.
- The objective of the study is vague and not clear and specific.
- The Introduction is very short and not enough for study and does not have solidarity and integrity. The concept of Privatization is not explained in a good manner.
- Please present the search strategy table in one of the databases.
- Please clarify the inclusion and exclusion criteria.
- Please present the flow diagram of the study.
- The classification logic of findings is not clear.
- The discussion and conclusion section is very disordered and not cohesive. The discussion was not organized based on the order of findings.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 15 Jan 2021

Dear AE,

The scope of the study is an important issue in the field of healthcare, However, I believe the paper can be significantly improved by attending following points:

• Please write a “review article” term in the article title

• Please correct the abstract in accordance with the guidelines of the journal

• In keywords: write keywords based on the MeSH system

• The syntax related to each of the electronic databases should be mentioned clearly in a properly designed table.

• It is necessary to add a screening table.

• How many persons participated in doing a search, screening, selecting, and extracting data? (Mention them and their expertise).

• In searching the gray literature, what kind of documents and databases were searched and how?

• The PRISMA flowchart should be completed.

• What were the study limitations (it should be mentioned).

• It is still vague what is the benefit of doing such a systematic review and what gaps has it covered?

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 15 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,

The decision about the manuscript entitle"Iranian healthcare system and the raising wave of privatisation" is Major Revision.

Best,

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (0) 17 Jan 2021

Dear Author

According to reviewers' 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.

I appreciate the reviewers' comments. Very useful and wise comments

Review 1 suggest minor corrections and think that the study is an important issue in the field of healthcare.

Reviewer suggest that the paper can be significantly improved by attending following points:

Reviewer comment	Author respond
Please write a "review article" term in the article title	A literature review is added
Please correct abstract in accordance with the guidelines of journal	The abstract is changed according to guidelines
In keywords: write key words based on MeSH system	Done according to following: Islamic Republic of Iran, health care, privatizations, public-private Sector, health expenditure, out- of- pocket payments, inequality
The syntax related to each of the electronic databases should be mentioned clearly in a properly designed table.	Done according to comment. Please see the new table. Table 1 And please see page 2 - The remaining 70 citations (39 peer reviewed articles, 2 editorial/correspondence to peer review journals and 29 documents and reports) were included in this study (Please see Table 2 and Prisma flow chart for a detailed overview). Table 2 is added to address the 39 peer reviewed articles, 2 editorial/correspondence to peer review journals in detail
It is necessary to add a screening table	Please see prisma flow and the description for screening and eligibility. The changes is marked in yellow colour
How many persons participated in doing search, screening, select and extracting data? (Mention them and their expertise).	Please see page 2 - A database search specialist at Mälardalen University library performed electronic data base searches in consultation with the author.
In searching the gray literature, what kind of documents and databases were searched and how?	Thank you very good point, the following is added Please see page 2 A grey literature search plan were used by incorporating three different searching strategies: (1) customized Google search engines, (2) targeted academic websites and key organisations in Persian and (3) on-line newspapers and magazines in Persian which were sources of non-academic information

	but can often provide a source of evidence for news and governmental policy documents/reports on expanding the privatization process in health care. The key search words were iran, privatization, health care, public health and inequality.
The PRISMA flowchart should be completed.	Please see the Prisma – It is now completed
What were the study limitations (it should be mentioned).	Very good point, thanks. Limitations and strength is added. Please see page 8
It is still vague what is the benefit of doing such systematic review and what gaps has it covered?	Very good point, thanks. Please see Last sentences in page 8 This literature review contribute to understand health care privatization and the embedding of inequality. It also identify need for additional research about the consequences of health service privatisation for equality and equity in health care in Iran.

Reviewer 2:

Reviewer comment	Author respond
The Title not suitable for study and very ambiguous.	A literature review is added
In the abstract: Mention the Time period of search.	Very good point, thanks. Added, Please see the abstract – method part
The objective of study is vague and not clear and specific.	Thank you for the comment, it is an aim formulation that is used in many other studies and is adequate for a literature review
The Introduction very short and not enough for study and not have solidarity and integrity.	The introduction and the length of introduction is according to journal guidelines and other studies that is published by this journal
The concept of Privatization not explain in good manner.	Thank you for the comment, good manner is subjective. The concept is defined through the studies that are included
Please present the search strategy table in one of databases.	It is added. Please see Table 1
Please clarify the inclusion and exclusion criteria.	Please see page 2- Inclusion criteria were scientific peer-reviewed empirical and original studies published in English or Persian between 1984 - October 2020. Both qualitative and quantitative full text articles

	but also commentaries, editorials, correspondences and brief reports were included. Studies merely reporting on health care professionals and case studies were excluded.
Please present the flow diagram of study.	Please see flow diagram
The classification logic of findings not clear.	Thank you for the comment. The findings is classified according to that: The articles were then read and categorised into groups depending on the focus of the article in relation to health care system and privatization. Based on the content of the studies, six themes were created. The result and discussion section follows the structure of these themes.
The discussion and conclusion section is very disordered and not cohesive. The discussion not organized based on order of findings.	Thank you for the comment. In conclusion part there is an attempt to evaluate the findings and as later adds in conclusion: One more strength is that the present study not simply summarizes research findings without critical evaluation.

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) 10 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
- Title: privatization or privatization? Check it
- If you used of popular newspapers and magazines or Persian journals?
- Abstract: in method section indicate to PRISMA guideline.
- Abstract: The stated results are not based on the purpose of the study. Rewrite again.
- Abstract: write conclusion based on the result section. Eg. How you found that process of privatization of health care system in Iran occurred with poor monitoring and evaluation mechanisms? It not declared in results.
- Write manuscript heading based on the journal guideline.
- The manuscript should be revised by a native English expert.
- It seems that rewrite introduction section. Also, discuss about the importance of privatization in the world and in other countries.
- Before the study objective, write the importance of study clearly.
- Method: remove footnote.
- Write the discussion and conclusion section separately. Referee to the journal guideline.
- Table 1. what is meaning of "Antal träffar" or "Sökord". Replace with English terminology.
- Table 2. in the first column, please write only the first authors. Eg. –Khosravi. et al.
- Specify the location of tables and figure in the manuscript.
Best,

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 10 Feb 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript has been revised in the last round; however, there are still points that need to be addressed by the authors
Regards,

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (1) 12 Feb 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.

I appreciate the reviewers' comments. Very useful and wise comments

Reviewer suggest that the paper can be significantly improved by attending following points:

Reviewer comment	Author respond
Title: privatization or privatization? Check it	Thank you for the comment, I changed to privatization in the title
If you used of popular newspapers and magazines or Persian journals?	Yes. It is described as follow in the abstract: A grey literature search plan were used by incorporating customized Google search engines, targeted academic websites and key organisations in Persian and on-line newspapers and magazines in Persian. And in the method section: A grey literature search plan were used by incorporating three different searching strategies: (1) customized Google search engines, (2) targeted academic websites and key organisations in Persian and (3) on-line newspapers and magazines in Persian which were sources of non-academic information but can often provide a source of evidence for news and governmental policy documents/reports on expanding the privatization process in health care.
Abstract: in method section indicate to PRISMA guideline.	Thank you for the comment, this sentence is added PRISMA guidelines were followed for abstracting data and assessing the quality of the studies. The chart is revised
Abstract: The stated results are not based on the purpose of the study. Rewrite again.	Thank you for the comment. Changes have been done in the formulation of aim. Please see abstract and page 2 The aim of this study is to systematically review the literature on the Iranian healthcare system in the time of increasing privatization. And also added some parts in results. Please see abstract Changes have been done please see abstract Six health-related items has been identified in the time of increased privatization in health care system. These items consists of Medical establishments, accessibility, Catastrophic health expenditure (CHE), Out-of-Pocket Payment (OOP), Health inequality,

	Privatization and health care providers and The Policy and finance of privatization.
Abstract: write conclusion based on the result section. Eg. How you found that process of privatization of health care system in Iran occurred with poor monitoring and evaluation mechanisms? It not declared in results.	The conclusion is based on results. Please see The Policy and finance of privatization in result and the refernces54-57 + 42
Write manuscript heading based on the journal guideline.	It is done according to: Health Scope | Knowledge base: Systematic Review or Meta Analysis Last Update : 2020-11-01 15:04:28 (kowsarpub.com)
The manuscript should be revised by a native English expert.	Has been revised by an native English expert
It seems that rewrite introduction section. Also, discuss about the importance of privatization in the world and in other countries.	Thank you for the comment. This is an article with focus on Iran. The introduction, regarding word limits, is also focused on Iran. However in the conclusion the aspects the international aspects and even the theoretical aspects such as “pushing factors” has been discussed.
Before the study objective, write the importance of study clearly.	Thank you for the comment. This sentence added before aim in page 2 However, no studies have focused on the effect on the Iranian healthcare system during the period of privatisation. Hence, the aim of this study was to systematically review the literature on the Iranian healthcare system in the time of increasing privatization. Additionally, as another reviewer pointed out before the sentence “This literature review contribute to understand health care privatization and the embedding of inequality. It also identify need for additional research about the consequences of health service privatisation for equality and equity in health care in Iran”. Added in the end of conclusion.
Method: remove footnote.	Thank you for the comment. It is deleted.

Write discussion and conclusion section separately. Referee to the journal guideline.	It is done according to: Health Scope | Knowledge base: Systematic Review or Meta Analysis Last Update : 2020-11-01 15:04:28 (kowsarpub.com)
Table 1. what is meaning of "Antal träffar" or "Sökord". Replace with English terminology.	Thank you for the comment. The change is done, please see table 1
Table 2. in the first column, please write only the first authors. Eg. –Khosravi. et al.	Thank you for the comment. The change is done, please see table 2
Specify the location of tables and figure in the manuscript.	Thank you for the comment. It is done.

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) 4 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
Please attention to the below comments:
- Write the manuscript heading based on the journal guideline. Kindly see the last issue of the journal. - For example: where is the discussion section? Replace the conclusion with the discussion. Write a brief conclusion before the limitation section. Replace "Context and objective" with the background. Add "Method" heading before "Data sources and search strategy"
- Again: The manuscript should be revised by a native English expert. For example; wrong use of the capital letter in the text "Privatization and healthcare providers and The Policy and finance of privatization"
- Again: Write the discussion and conclusion section separately. Referee to the last issue of the journal.
- Table 2, kindly add a column about the main findings of each study.
- Table 2, kindly sort the studies based on the year.
- In figure 1 stated that 70 studies were entered into the analysis; however, in Table 2, 41 studies were investigated. Check it.
- Line 146: Kindly remove " Iraj Harirchi "
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 4 Apr 2021

Dear EIC,
According to the reviewer's comments, the manuscript nee minor revision.
best,

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (2) 5 Apr 2021

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

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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.

Reply to reviewer

Tables are drawn by table tools of Microsoft office Word in the manuscript.

Flow Diagram is both in the text and manuscript.

Tables and flow diagram highlighted by yellow colour.

I hope everything is clear now.

All best

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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** (3) 5 May 2021

Dear EIC,
The revision of the manuscript entitled " Iranian healthcare system and the rising wave of privatization - A literature review" has done in accordance with the reviews' comments. It could be published in the journal.
Best,

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (3) 10 May 2021

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