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-119063
Published in: Health Scope: 11(1); e119063

Peer Review Report for "At-risk COVID-19 Patients; Knowledge and Attitude of Those in Need of Transfer to Hospital and Consequences in Non-transferred Patients"

Author(s): Peyman Saberian, Mina Hesami, Nader Tavakoli, Parisa Hasani-Sharamin, Zohreh Ahmadi Hatami, Fatemeh Dadashi, Alireza Baratloo

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 13 Sep 2021
Revised Date: 12 Mar 2022
Accepted Date: 16 Mar 2022

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Maryam Seraji: Reviewer | Revision (0) 13 Nov 2021

Dear author
Please
1-Abstract: Validity and reliability of the questionnaire
2-Sample volume formula
3-Complete validity and reliability in the implementation method
4-Table 4 needs to be edited
5-References 11-12 should be modified according to the structure of the journal
6-Discussion: Use dissimilar studies and mention the reasons
7-The article needs to be edited by a native editor
8-Add the fear variable to the final conclusion
9-The discussion should be written in the order of the results. Fear in the discussion?
10-Remove statistical analysis and write according to the context of the journal

Mohammad Khammarnia: Reviewer | **Revision (0)** 14 Nov 2021

Abstract, method: indicate the year/s that the study was conducted.
The introduction section was written briefly. Use of more references. Indicate more about the issue in the world and Iran.
Method: How the participants were selected? What criteria were considered? Inclusion and exclusion criteria?
"The calculated sample size was 456"??? Describe more about the sampling method.
"Its reliability and validity were confirmed before starting the study"??? How? Describe more.
The results section is long. Write more briefly
Use of the following papers:
Using eVisit to Reduce Patient Referrals to Clinics and Physician Offices: A Safe Way for Controlling COVID-19 Outbreak
Application of Intelligent Technologies on Response to Covid-19 and Occupational Safety in Healthcare Workers
Barriers and Drivers of Public Preventive Behavioral Responses to COVID-19 Outbreak: Evidence from Iran

Best,

Gholamreza Masoudy: Reviewer | **Revision (0)** 16 Nov 2021

1- The sampling method that the data based on was selected should be included in the method.
2- The keywords should be revised based on MESH (Underline)
3- By what method were the reliability and validity of the questionnaire confirmed?
1- In the method, the participants have written 456 individuals but in the abstract, the sample size is 201, and 158 people in each group.
2- In the analysis table the used test is included.
3- In the first paragraph of the discussion the general idea obtained from the results is included.

Gholamreza Masoudy: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 16 Nov 2021

editor in chief:

The manuscript entitles (At risk COVID-19 patients; Knowledge and attitude of who need to be transferred to the hospital and consequences in the non-transferred group;)was reviewed by the reviewers and the following comments were reported by them.
Abstract:
1- 1- The sampling method that the data based on was selected should be included in the method.
2- The keywords should be revised based on MESH (Underline)
3- By what method were the reliability and validity of the questionnaire confirmed?
4- In the method, the participants have written 456 individuals but in the abstract, the sample size is 201, and 158 people in each group.

5- In the analysis table, the used test should be included.
6- In the first paragraph of the discussion the general idea obtained from the results included
2- Reviewer 2:
7- Abstract, method: indicate the year/s that the study was conducted.
The introduction section was written briefly. Use of more references. Indicate more about the issue in the world and Iran.
8- Method: How the participants were selected? What criteria were considered? Inclusion and exclusion criteria?
9- "The calculated sample size was 456"??? Describe more about the sampling method. "Its reliability and validity were confirmed before starting the study"??? How? Describe more.
The results section is long. Write more briefly
- Use of the following papers:
10- Using eVisit to Reduce Patient Referrals to Clinics and Physician Offices: A Safe Way for Controlling COVID-19 Outbreak
11- Application of Intelligent Technologies on Response to Covid-19 and Occupational Safety in Healthcare Workers
12- Barriers and Drivers of Public Preventive Behavioral Responses to COVID-19 Outbreak: Evidence from Iran
Reviewer 3: 1-Abstract: Validity and reliability of the questionnaire
2-Sample volume formula
3-Complete validity and reliability in the implementation method
4-Table 4 needs to be edited
5-References 11-12 should be modified according to the structure of the journal
6-Discussion: Use dissimilar studies and mention the reasons
7-The article needs to be edited by a native editor
8-Add the fear variable to the conclusion
9-The discussion should be written in the order of the results. Fear in the discussion?
10-Remove statistical analysis and write according to the context of the journal

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision (0)** 20 Nov 2021

Dear Author

According to reviewer 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.

Reply to reviewers

- **Journal:** Health Scope
- **Manuscript ID:** 119063
- **Manuscript Title:** At risk COVID-19 patients; Knowledge and attitude of who needs to be transferred to the hospital and consequences in the non-transferred group

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Comment: The manuscript should be revised considering the native English language
Reply: We made another look in terms of the English edition; The paper is also going to be edited routinely by the journal publisher (Briefland) if accepted

Comment: More explains the study hypothesis
Reply: For your comment, we made some revisions in the last paragraph of the main text.

Reviewer 2:
Comment: All corrections have been made and are acceptable and publishable.
Reply Thanks for your help to improve our paper.

Reviewer 3:
The previous comments had been revised well. However, it should be amended based on the following comments:
- Indicate to Informed Consent Form in the method section.
Reply: Data gathering was conducted via telephone call interviews with eligible ones, and verbal informed consent was received before starting the conversation.

- The manuscript should be checked and revised by a Native English Language Expert.
Reply: We made another look in terms of the English edition; The paper is also going to be edited routinely by the journal publisher (Briefland) if accepted

- Indicate Project Grant Number before the reference section.
Reply: It has been mentioned on the title page which was submitted separately, alongside other required declarations.

- Rewrite the conclusion section. Avoid repeating the findings in this section. Write the main conclusion.
Reply: For your comment, we made revisions in the conclusion part.

Best,

Sincerely

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) 16 Jan 2022

The previous comments had been revised well. However, it should be amended based on the following comments:
- Indicate to Informed Consent Form in the method section.
- The manuscript should be checked and revised by a Native English Language Expert.
- Indicate Project Grant Number before the reference section.
- Rewrite the conclusion section. Avoid repeating the findings in this section. Write the main conclusion.

Best,

Maryam Seraji: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 19 Jan 2022

All corrections have been made and are acceptable and publishable.

Gholamreza Masoudy: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 22 Feb 2022

The manuscript should be revised considering the native English language
More explain the study hypothesis

Gholamreza Masoudy: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 23 Feb 2022

Reviewer 1:
The manuscript should be revised considering the native English language
more explain the study hypothesis.
Reviewer 2:
All corrections have been made and are acceptable and publishable.
Reviewer 3:
The previous comments had been revised well. However, it should be amended based on the following comments:
- Indicate to Informed Consent Form in the method section.
- The manuscript should be checked and revised by a Native English Language Expert.
- Indicate Project Grant Number before the reference section.
- Rewrite the conclusion section. Avoid repeating the findings in this section. Write the main conclusion.

Reviewer 1:
The manuscript should be revised considering the native English language
more explain the study hypothesis.
Reviewer 2:
All corrections have been made and are acceptable and publishable.
Reviewer 3:
The previous comments had been revised well. However, it should be amended based on the following comments:
- Indicate to Informed Consent Form in the method section.
- The manuscript should be checked and revised by a Native English Language Expert.
- Indicate Project Grant Number before the reference section.
- Rewrite the conclusion section. Avoid repeating the findings in this section. Write the main conclusion.
Best, Best,

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision (1)** 23 Feb 2022

Reviewer 1:
The manuscript should be revised considering the native English language
more explain the study hypothesis.
Reviewer 2:
All corrections have been made and are acceptable and publishable.
Reviewer 3:
The previous comments had been revised well. However, it should be amended based on the following comments:
- Indicate to Informed Consent Form in the method section.
- The manuscript should be checked and revised by a Native English Language Expert.
- Indicate Project Grant Number before the reference section.
- Rewrite the conclusion section. Avoid repeating the findings in this section. Write the main conclusion.
Best,

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.

Reply to reviewers

- **Journal:** Health Scope
- **Manuscript ID:** 119063
- **Manuscript Title:** At risk COVID-19 patients; Knowledge and attitude of who needs to be transferred to the hospital and consequences in the non-transferred group

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Abstract, method: indicate the year/s that the study was conducted
Reply: Done. The study was conducted from 21 May 2020 until 20 June 2020.

The introduction section was written briefly. Use of more references. Indicate more about the issue in the world and Iran.
Reply: Concerning your comments, the introduction part expanded with more related references.

Method: How the participants were selected? What criteria were considered? Inclusion and exclusion criteria? "The calculated sample size was 456"??? Describe more about the sampling method.
Reply: To your comment, more details were added under the "Study population" subheading

"Its reliability and validity were confirmed before starting the study"??? How? Describe more.
Reply: It was a Farsi questionnaire and its reliability and validity were assessed previously, More details were also added under the subheading "data gathering".

The results section is long. Write more briefly
Reply: For your comment, some parts of the results' text and also appendixes 1-3 were removed.

Use of the following papers:
Using eVisit to Reduce Patient Referrals to Clinics and Physician Offices: A Safe Way for Controlling COVID-19 Outbreak
Application of Intelligent Technologies on Response to Covid-19 and Occupational Safety in Healthcare Workers
Barriers and Drivers of Public Preventive Behavioral Responses to COVID-19 Outbreak: Evidence from Iran
Reply: All mentioned references were inserted into the text.

Best,
Kind Regards

Reviewer 2:
Dear author
Please
1-Abstract: Validity and reliability of the questionnaire
Reply: It was mentioned.

2-Sample volume formula
Reply: Concerning your comment, details were added.

3-Complete validity and reliability in the implementation method
Reply: Done

4-Table 4 needs to be edited
Reply: Done

5-References 11-12 should be modified according to the structure of the journal
Reply: All references were rechecked in this regard.

6-Discussion: Use dissimilar studies and mention the reasons
Reply: Done.

7-The article needs to be edited by a native editor
Reply: Done.

8-Add the fear variable to the conclusion
Reply: Done.

9-The discussion should be written in the order of the results. Fear in the discussion?
Reply: Done.

10-Remove statistical analysis and write according to the context of the journal
Reply: I checked "Instruction for authors" on the journal website and also check so many published papers in Health Scope, and found that some used subheadings and some did not; we prefer to use them, but if necessary, all subheadings could be removed.

Reviewer 3:
1- The sampling method that the data based on was selected should be included in the method.
Reply: Done.

2- The keywords should be revised based on MESH (Underline)

Reply: Just “underline diseases” was not compatible with MeSH, and that was replaced with “Chronic disease”

3- By what method were the reliability and validity of the questionnaire confirmed?
Reply: It was a Farsi questionnaire and its reliability and validity were assessed previously, More details were also added under the subheading “data gathering”.

4- In the method, the participants have written 456 individuals but in the abstract, the sample size is 201, and 158 people in each group.
Reply: The calculated sample size for each group was 228. In The transferred patient group, we called 230 individuals and 201 of them replied; in the non-transferred patient group, we called 230 individuals and 158 of them replied.

5- In the analysis table the used test is included.
Reply: Done.

6- In the first paragraph of the discussion the general idea obtained from the results is included.
Reply: Done.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
editor in chief:

The manuscript entitles (At risk COVID-19 patients; Knowledge and attitude of who need to be transferred to the hospital and consequences in the non-transferred group;)was reviewed by the reviewers and the following comments were reported by them.
Abstract:
1- The sampling method that the data based on was selected should be included in the method.
2- The keywords should be revised based on MESH (Underline)
3- By what method were the reliability and validity of the questionnaire confirmed?
4- In the method, the participants have written 456 individuals but in the abstract, the sample size is 201, and 158 people in each group.
5- In the analysis table, the used test should be included.
6- In the first paragraph of the discussion the general idea obtained from the results included
2- Reviewer 2:
7- Abstract, method: indicate the year/s that the study was conducted.
The introduction section was written briefly. Use of more references. Indicate more about the issue in the world and Iran.
8- Method: How the participants were selected? What criteria were considered? Inclusion and exclusion criteria?
9- "The calculated sample size was 456"??? Describe more about the sampling method.
"Its reliability and validity were confirmed before starting the study"??? How? Describe more.
The results section is long. Write more briefly
- Use of the following papers:

10- Using eVisit to Reduce Patient Referrals to Clinics and Physician Offices: A Safe Way for Controlling COVID-19 Outbreak
11- Application of Intelligent Technologies on Response to Covid-19 and Occupational Safety in Healthcare Workers
12- Barriers and Drivers of Public Preventive Behavioral Responses to COVID-19 Outbreak: Evidence from Iran
Reviewer 3: 1-Abstract: Validity and reliability of the questionnaire
2-Sample volume formula
3-Complete validity and reliability in the implementation method
4-Table 4 needs to be edited
5-References 11-12 should be modified according to the structure of the journal
6-Discussion: Use dissimilar studies and mention the reasons
7-The article needs to be edited by a native editor
8-Add the fear variable to the conclusion
9-The discussion should be written in the order of the results. Fear in the discussion?
10-Remove statistical analysis and write according to the context of the journal

Dear Associate Editor
We tried our best to revise all mentioned points to the reviewers' comments.
All changes were highlighted with green color.
Kind Regards

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.

Gholamreza Masoudy: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 15 Mar 2022

After the editing by an English language expert, the manuscript will be prepared for publishing

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (2) 16 Mar 2022

Dear Editor:
After the editing by an English language expert, the manuscript will be prepared for publishing.