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: https://doi.org/10.5812/jhealthscope.113282
Published in: Health Scope: 10(2); e113282

Peer Review Report for "Comparison of Health-care Waste Management in Urban and Rural Areas in Iran: Application of Multi-criteria Decision Making Method"

Author(s): Nourooz Ali Azizkhani, Soheyla Gholami, Salifu Yusif , Saeideh Moosavi, Seyedeh Fatemeh Miri, Rohollah Kalhor

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	26 Jan 2021
Revised Date:	8 May 2021
Accepted Date:	14 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.

Mohammad Mehrtak: Reviewer | Revision (0) 11 Feb 2021

Minor Revision
Dear Authors;
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:

Abstract
• In the method section: Please mention the number of waste disposal methods and criteria.
• In Results, please write weights of the best waste disposal methods in urban and rural areas.
• In keywords: write keywords based on the MeSH system

Discussion
• Strength points and limitations of the study are not mentioned. Please Write this and

Explain in more detail what you did to overcome this limitation in future studies.

References:
• Please correct the references in accordance with the guidelines of the journal.

peivand bastani: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 13 Feb 2021

Please find the comments in the attached file.

Reza Ghanbari: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 14 Feb 2021

Dear Editor in chief
The submitted manuscript has been reviewed. The researchers have compared the different methods of Health-care Waste Management in Urban and Rural Areas of Iran through a multi-criteria decision-making method. In order to do that, different methods of disposal have been analyzed by experts and the best methods have been proposed.
The subject of the research and the overall quality of the manuscript is good. Therefore the current manuscript could be published but there are some general comments as follow:

The overall quality of English is better to be improved.
The abstract and the background are acceptable but they could be more suitable by using sentences to highlight the importance of the research.

Thank you

Hossein Kamani: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 15 Feb 2021

Dear Editor my comments about the mentioned manuscript are as follows:
-Please write an abstract without a multi-section, write it in one section.
-Embed the “Objective” section in the previous section in the abstract and in the text.
-keywords list isn’t suitable for your title. Keywords must be selected from Mesh, please revise them.
- Mention the advantages of the method that you used in this study.
Refer to the few related studies in the introduction.
The discussion is not written well. Compare the results with another study in the discussion.
There are language and writing problems in this manuscript. Revise it with a language expert.
Best regards

Mohammad Khammarnia: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 20 Feb 2021

Dear Editor,
The manuscript needs minor revision.
Best

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (0) 22 Feb 2021

Dear Author

According to reviewer comments, the manuscript needs “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 Editor-in-Chief

Thanks to the honorable reviewers to provide appropriate recommendations. All recommendations are due on the views of respected reviewers and were corrected in the manuscript and highlighted with green color.

Best regard

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Please find the comments in the attached file. All recommendations are done in the manuscript and highlighted with green color.
Reviewer 2:
Minor Revision
Dear Authors;
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:

Abstract
• In the method section: Please mention the number of waste disposal methods and criteria.- it is done and highlighted with green color
• In Results, please write weights of the best waste disposal methods in urban and rural areas. These items were added and highlighted with green color
• In keywords: write keywords based on the MeSH system- all keywords checked with Mesh and rewrite

Discussion
• Strength points and limitations of the study are not mentioned. Please Write this and Explain in more detail what you did to overcome this limitation in future studies. .- it is done and highlighted with green color

References:
• Please correct the references to the guidelines of the journal- .- it is done

Reviewer 3:
Dear Editor my comments about the mentioned manuscript are as follows:
-Please write an abstract without a multi-section, write it in one section. Corrected according to the journal writing instructions
-Embed the “Objective” section in the previous section in the abstract and text.

Corrected according to the journal writing instructions
-keywords list isn't suitable for your title. Keywords must be selected from Mesh, please revise them. all keywords checked with Mesh and rewrite

- Mention the advantages of the method that you used in this study. .- it is done and highlighted with green color

Refer to the few related studies in the introduction. it is done and highlighted with green color

The discussion is not written well. Compare the results with another study in the discussion.
There are language and writing problems in this manuscript. Revise it with a language expert. All manuscripts are revised by the native language editor.
Best regards

Reviewer 4:
Dear Editor in chief
The submitted manuscript has been reviewed. The researchers have compared the different methods of Health-care Waste Management in Urban and Rural Areas of Iran through a multi-criteria decision-making method. To do that, different methods of disposal have been analyzed by experts and the best methods have been proposed. The subject of the research and the overall quality of the manuscript is good. Therefore the current manuscript could be published but there are some general comments as follow:

The overall quality of English is better to be improved. All manuscripts are revised by the native language editor.
The abstract and the background are acceptable but they could be more suitable by using sentences to highlight the importance of the research. .- it is done and highlighted with green color

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.

Mohammad Khammarnia: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 21 Apr 2021

Dear Authors,
The manuscript ad revised based on the previous comments. The quality of the manuscript is good, however, the following additional comments are suggested for more quality improvement before the manuscript publication:
- Kindly, check the manuscript for Possible grammatical errors. For example:
We employed a cross-sectional study in this study….
In urban areas, the best methods are irradiation (0.839), and microwave (0.794), and in rural areas are, respectively, sterilized steam…
Inclusion criteria for the study for experts….
- Check line 77 for the edition
- Kindly use the following published papers:
Determination of Hospital Waste Composition and Management in Amol City, Iran
Construction and Demolition Waste and Its Management Challenges in Iran: A Case Study in Tabriz City

- In line 83, the authors stated that "To do the authors searched through relevant databases, which include but were not limited to Medline, Scopus, and extracted articles for review ". Please describe more about the results of this section in a Table.

Best,

Mohammad Khammarnia: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 21 Apr 2021

Dear Editor,
According to the reviewer's comments, the manuscript needs Minor Revision
Best

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

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-in-Chief

Thanks to the honorable reviewers to provide appropriate recommendations. All recommendations are due on the views of respected reviewers and were corrected in the manuscript and highlighted with yellow color.

Best regard

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Dear Authors,
The manuscript ad revised based on the previous comments. The quality of the manuscript is good, however, the following additional comments are suggested for more quality improvement before the manuscript publication: All below recommendations are done
- Kindly, check the manuscript for Possible grammatical errors. For example:
We employed a cross-sectional study in this study….
In urban areas, the best methods are irradiation (0.839), and microwave (0.794), and in rural areas are, respectively, sterilized steam…
Inclusion criteria for the study for experts….
- Check line 77 for the edition
- Kindly use the following published papers:
Determination of Hospital Waste Composition and Management in Amol City, Iran
Construction and Demolition Waste and Its Management Challenges in Iran: A Case Study in Tabriz City

- In line 83, the authors stated that "To do the authors searched through relevant databases, which include but were not limited to Medline, Scopus, and extracted articles for review ". Please describe more about the results of this section in a Table.

Results of this section showed in table Table 2 (criteria) Table 3 and Table 4 (methods of waste disposal) and due to the limitation of the number of tables in the article are not reported as a separate tables.

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.

Mohammad Khammarnia: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 11 May 2021

Dear Editor,
The manuscript's corrections are well done. It has the necessary criteria for publication in the journal.
Best,

Mohammad Khammarnia: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 11 May 2021

Dear Editor,
The manuscript's corrections are well done. It has the necessary criteria for publication in the journal.
Best,

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (2) 14 May 2021

Dear Author

According to reviewer comments, Your article has been accepted for publication
Best Regards
Dr. Mirzaei