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.112409
Published in: Health Scope: 10(2); e112409

Peer Review Report for "Measuring Liveability in Iranian Cities Using the Global Liveable City Index (GLCI)"

Author(s): Zahra Khorrami, Moghaddameh Mirzaee, Mohammad Mehdi Fadakar Davarani, Narges Khanjani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 5 Jan 2021
Revised Date: 21 Apr 2021
Accepted Date: 28 Apr 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)

1 Mar 2021

Dear AE
The manuscript needs minor revision as follows:
1. The type of study should be added in the Materials and Methods section.
2. In the method section, it is stated that the provincial centers were selected; However, cities like Zabol are not the provincial center. Also, in Table 1, the title Alborz has been used incorrectly instead of Karaj. Please correct these items.
3. Check the text in the Results section with Table 1 and the figures. In some cases, they seem to contradict each other. For example, the last paragraph in “Overall liveability ranking” part in the Method section needs to be revised.
4. What are the practical recommendations for health policy makers and decision makers regarding the results of this study?
5. Suggestions for further studies should be added in the Discussion section.
Best Regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 22 Mar 2021

Dear AE,
The authors should explain completely the application of this study.
What are the pros and cons of this study? They are unknown.
other parts and items were well done.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 8 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
- In the title, the Sentence "global liveable city index", each word should be capitalized.
- In the Introduction part, line 11, instead of 54%, should write Fifty-four percent (it's in the beginning of the Sentence)
- In the "Data sources and constraints" part in line 11, I recommend you give an example for third solution.
- In the results section, it is mentioned that "Domestic Security and Stability was the only domain with a Shapley weight less than the equal weight level (20%) and was 19.5%." while in the first sentences of Result section you mentioned "the Shapley weights were 19% for Domestic Security and Stability, 19.5% for socio-cultural conditions,"!
- In the last line of page 6 (Result section) Alborz is a province not a city.
- The line 3 in page 7, it's Figure 1. E not D.
- Use unique terminology (Isfahan or Esfahan). In some parts of the paper, you used Esfahan and other ones are Isfahan.
- All the cities mentioned in the article are provincial capitals except Zabol. Do you have a logical reason for this choice?
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 9 Apr 2021

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,

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (0) 15 Apr 2021

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.

Thanks for reviewing our article.
Our responses to the reviewers' points have been listed below.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

- In the title, the Sentence "global liveable city index", each word should be capitalized.
OK, we corrected that.

- In the Introduction part, line 11, instead of 54%, should write Fifty-four percent (it's at the beginning of the Sentence.
OK, we corrected that.

- In the "Data sources and constraints" part in line 11, I recommend you give an example for the third solution.
An example for the third solution was that we used the Modified Drinking Water Quality Index (MDWQI (instead of Industrial Waste Discharged into Water Sources (to measure all types of industrial waste discharged into water sources).

- In the results section, it is mentioned that "Domestic Security and Stability was the only domain with a Shapley weight less than the equal weight level (20%) and was 19.5%." while in the first sentences of Result section you mentioned "the Shapley weights were 19% for Domestic Security and Stability, 19.5% for socio-cultural conditions,"!
Sorry for that mistake. We corrected that.

- In the last line of page 6 (Result section) Alborz is a province not a city.
We corrected that.

- The line 3 in page 7, it's Figure 1. E not D.
We corrected that.

- Use unique terminology (Isfahan or Esfahan). In some parts of the paper, you used Esfahan and other ones are Isfahan.
We wrote "Isfahan" throughout the text.

- All the cities mentioned in the article are provincial capitals except Zabol. Do you have a logical reason for this choice?
Thank you for raising this issue. It was a typographic error; all provincial capitals were evaluated. This issue was corrected throughout the manuscript.

Reviewer 2:

The manuscript needs minor revision as follows:
1. The type of study should be added in the Materials and Methods section.
OK, we added that in the methods section.

2. In the method section, it is stated that the provincial centers were selected; however, cities like Zabol are not the provincial center. Also, in Table 1, the title Alborz has been used incorrectly instead of Karaj. Please correct these items.
Sorry for the mistake, we corrected that.

3. Check the text in the Results section with Table 1 and the figures. In some cases, they seem to contradict each other. For example, the last paragraph in "Overall liveability ranking" part in the Method section needs to be revised.
We checked and revised these sections.

4. What are the practical recommendations for health policy makers and decision makers regarding the results of this study?
Thank you for raising this important point. We explained this further in the last paragraph of the Discussion.

5. Suggestions for further studies should be added in the Discussion section.
OK, we explained this further in the Discussion.

Reviewer 3:

the authors should explain completely about the application of this study.
OK, we elaborated on this in the Discussion section.

What are the pros and cons of this study? They are unknown.
other parts and items well done.
We explained this further in the last paragraph of the Discussion.

Thankyou very much for reviewing our article.
Please let us know if any further corrections are needed.

N.K.
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) 25 Apr 2021

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

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (1) 28 Apr 2021

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.