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.117666
Published in: Health Scope: 10(4); e117666

Peer Review Report for "A Proposed Managerial Model for Improvement of Blood Consumption in the Operating Rooms in Southern Iran"

Author(s): Maryam Gholami, Kamran Hajinabi, Leila Riahi, Sezaneh Haghpanah

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 6 Jul 2021
Revised Date: 13 Sep 2021
Accepted Date: 30 Sep 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) — 25 Jul 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1- How to allocate the sample size and type of sampling
2- Mention model path analysis in the working method
3- Factor load values and significance of each factor should be plotted separately in the table
4- The fit index of each factor should be drawn separately in the table
5- The results of the coefficient of determination of the model factors with the highest variance of resource allocation should be mentioned in a separate table
6- How to select a sample size for confirmatory factor analysis
7- Poor translation needs editing
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 30 Jul 2021

Dear AE,
Kindly attention the following comments:
- The manuscript should be edited by a native expert.

- "A designed questionnaire was designed"???? check the manuscript several times.
- How 185 persons were selected? Who persons were selected?
- Abstract, result section: The effect size of each factor should be mentioned.

Method section

- How comprehensive literature search was done to determine the effective factors? Indicate to search strategy in each data base, and the results of search.
- In the second step, how persons' opinions were gathered? How contributed in the study? Indicate detail.
- The details of the questionnaire, the number of questions and how to score should be mentioned
- Limitations and applications of the study should be mentioned at the end of the discussion
- Ethics code and the approved code of the project must be mentioned

Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 1 Aug 2021

Dear AE,

The manuscript has been reviewed and needs revision before it can be published.

• Inclusion and exclusion criteria should be mentioned.
• What is the search strategy in the first step?
• Please explain about sample size calculation.
• Explain about sampling for obtain reliability of the questionnaire
• Mention demographic data of participants such as age &sex…
• What are the acceptable value of CVI index and CVR in this study
• Please write the references according to Vancouver style. (References numbers 11,29,31)

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 2 Aug 2021

Dear EIC,

According to the reviewers' comments, the manuscript need revision.

Best,

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (0) 7 Aug 2021

Dear Author

According to reviewer comments, the manuscript need “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.

Thank you for reviewing the manuscript and valuable comments of the respected reviewers. We revised the manuscript accordingly and highlighted the changes in the manuscript. Also, we responded all comments of the respected reviewers point by point.

Thanks for your consideration and look forward to hearing back from you.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Dear Authors,
Kindly attention t the following comments:
-The manuscript should be edited by a native expert.
- "A designed questionnaire was designed"???? check the manuscript several times.
Answer
Thanks for this scientific comment. We, corrected this mistake and checked the manuscript accordingly. Also, the manuscript was edited by an English expert editor (Dr. Nasrin Shokrpour).

- How 185 persons were selected? Who persons were selected?
Answer:
Based on this valuable comment, we added more detailed explanations regarding the study population. Indeed, we used census method and considered all operating room technicians and anesthesiologists and surgeons who had desire to participate. Finally, 185 participants cooperated with us in this research and composed our study population.
Page:3. Line:14-23.

- Abstract, result section: The effect size of each factor should be mentioned.
Answer
Thanks for this scientific comment. However, due to the nature of our data, we were unable to calculate the effect size, so we calculated coefficient for each item and illustrated them instead in Table 3.

Method section
- How comprehensive literature search was done to determine the effective factors? Indicate to search strategy in each data base, and the results of search.

Answer:
Based on this valuable comment we added the related explanation in the method section.
Page:4. Line:4-22.

- In the second step, how persons' opinions were gathered? How contributed in the study? Indicate detail.
- The details of the questionnaire, the number of questions and how to score should be mentioned
Answer
Based on this valuable comment, we added more detailed explanations.
Page4 line:25-28, Page 5 line 1-2.

- Limitations and applications of the study should be mentioned at the end of the discussion
Answer:
It was fixed
Page:9 line:18-19.

- Ethics code and the approved code of the project must be mentioned
Answer:
It was fixed
Page:3 line:22-23.

In the Method
Reviewer 2:
Your manuscript has been reviewed and need revision before it can be published.
* Inclusion and exclusion criteria should be mentioned.
Answer
It was added
Page:3 line:17-19

* What is the search strategy in first step?
Answer
Page:4. Line:4-22.

* Please explain about sample size calculation.

Answer
In fact, we used census method and considered all operating room technicians and anesthesiologists and surgeons who had desire to participate in the research. Finally, 185 participants cooperated with us in this research and composed our study population.
Page:3. Line: 14-21.
* Explain about sampling for obtain reliability of the questionnaire
Answer:
Based on this scientific comment related explanation was added
Page:5 line:11-12

* Mention demographic data of participants such as age &sex…
It was added.
Page: 6 line: 5-6.

* What is acceptable value of CVI index and CVR in this study
Answer
It was added
Page:5 line:10

* Please write the references according to Vancouver style. (References numbers 11,29,31)
Answer
It was fixed

Reviewer 3:
Dear Editor in Chief
Please:
1-How to allocate the sample size and type of sampling
Answer
In fact, we used census method and considered all operating room technicians and anesthesiologists and surgeons who had desire to participate in the research. Finally, 185 participants cooperated with us in this research and composed our study population.
Page:3. Line:14-21.

2-Mention model path analysis in the working method
Answer
It was explained
Page:5 line:18-22, Page:6 line:1-2

3-Factor load values and significance of each factor should be plotted separately in the table
Answer
It was added in Table 2

4-The fit index of each factor should be drawn separately in the table
Answer
It was described in Table 4. And page 6 line 10-11

5-The results of the coefficient of determination of the model factors with the highest variance of resource allocation should be mentioned in a separate table
Answer
Based on this valuable comment, it was presented in Table 5.

6-How to select a sample size for confirmatory factor analysis
Answer:
Based on the Mundfrom et al.(2005) study(ref #16 was added), Suggested minimums for sample size include from 3 to 20 times the number of variables. As mentioned previously, 185 persons were participated in our study based on the census method which seems to be acceptable for for confirmatory factor analysis (8 samples per item).
Page:3. Line:19-21.

7-Poor translation needs editing
Answer
The manuscript was edited by an expert editor (Dr. Nasrin Shokrpour).

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Dear Editor,
According to the reviewers' comments, the manuscript need revision.
Best,

EIC Decision:

Dear Author

According to reviewer comments, the manuscript need "Major revision".
Best Regards

Uploaded Files by Reviewers/Associate Editor/EIC:

Below you can find list of files attached by reviewers or associate editor or EIC during the review process (if any).

No file

How to Revise?

Please sign in to the journal with your account and follow the instruction to resubmit your revised paper. With respect to time limits, we are looking forward to hearing from you soon in the mentioned time frame.

Kind Regards,

On Behalf of,
Prof. Ramazan Mirzaei | Editor-in-Chief | Health Scope [1]

* Contact Support: http://publisher.support [2]
* Subscribe [3] to our newsletter

> Please consider the environment before printing this email.

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) 15 Sep 2021

Dear AE,
All referee comments have been corrected and answered and can be published.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 21 Sep 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript entitles: "A proposed managerial model for improvement of Blood Consumption in the Operating Rooms in Southern Iran" could be published in the Journal
Best,

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (1) 30 Sep 2021

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