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://brief.land/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Health Scope
Article DOI: 10.5812/jhealthscope.119996
Published in: Health Scope: 10(4); e119996

Peer Review Report for "Utilization of Preventive Care Services at a University Hospital in Saudi Arabia"

Author(s): Mohammed Ali Al-Ghamdi, Rajaa M Al-Raddadi, Omar W Althomali, Abdulrahman S Bazaid

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 11 Oct 2021
Revised Date: 21 Nov 2021
Accepted Date: 23 Nov 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 Nov 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
Abstract:
- How the participants were selected? Indicate the number.
- Did not start the sentences with numbers.
- Did you use of questionnaire? Describe more.
- Rewrite the below sentences:
- However, if individuals' preventive services are seen approximately only a third of participants used such services.
- Method: describe the validity and reliability of the questionnaire.
- Describe ethical consideration and informed consent form completion.
- References: Replace old references with new ones.
Best Regard

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 1 Nov 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs a minor Revision.
Best Regard

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (0) 3 Nov 2021

Dear Authors,
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.

Dear Editor,

Re: Revision of Utilisation of preventive care services at a university hospital in Saudi Arabia

We would like to thank the reviewer for their comments which were helpful. The response to each point raised has been detailed below and there is a copy of the MS on the submission site with mark-up of the changes made to the text.

LIST OF COMMENTS AND RESPONSES:

Reviewer 1

1. Abstract: How the participants were selected? Indicate the number.

RESPONSE: This was addressed and added to abstract as requested. Participants were randomly selected.

2. Did not start the sentences with numbers.

RESPONSE: This was addressed.

3. Did you used of questionnaire? Describe more.

RESPONSE: This was addressed and more information about questionnaire were added. line 10-11.

4. Rewrite the below sentences: However, if individuals' preventive services is seen approximately only third of participants used such services.

RESPONSE: This was addressed.

5. Method: describe about validity and reliability of the questionnaire.

RESPONSE: this was addressed, and more information were added. Line 89-94.

6. Describe about ethical consideration and informed consent form completion.

RESPONSE: Ethical approval section was added to Methods and consent form has been attached to the manuscript.

7. References: Replace old references with new

RESPONSE: This was addressed. References were updated.

Reviewer 2

8. Introduction: Please, develop the importance and necessity of research.

RESPONSE: This was addressed and importance of the study was described in line 72-80.

9. Methods: What was the inclusion and exclusion criteria?
RESPONSE: This was added to Methods (line 83-86).

10. How were the participants selected?

RESPONSE: This has been addressed and participants were randomly selected.

11. How is the satisfaction of the participants obtained?

RESPONSE: although assessing participants' satisfaction is important, it was not evaluated in the current study

12. Reliability and validity of the questionnaire?

RESPONSE: this was addressed, and more information were added. Line 89-94.

13. Questionnaire scoring details?

RESPONSE: This information was added. Participant was asked to rate their health and chose from a scale of four choses (poor- good – very good – excellent).

14. Have you obtained a license to use this software?

RESPONSE: Yes, the software is licensed

15. Delete line 113.

RESPONSE: This was deleted

16. Riyals to expressed in dollars should added (US)

RESPONSE: This was added below the Table 1

17. What was the distribution of the data in chi-square test

RESPONSE: Current data showed that most of cells (except three tests out of twenty) have an expected count greater than or equal to five which is the only assumption for the chi-square test for association regarding the distribution of the data. In those three tests the exact module was run and revealed the same results and did not show any statistically significant results therefore chi-square test for association results was presented.

18. Compare study results with similar studies

RESPONSE: comparison with other studies were added in line 212-217.

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) 14 Nov 2021

Dear AE,
Previous comments had been revised appropriately. In the final review round, the following comments can be considered;
- Abstract, method section: "during July 2019" OR in 2019. My suggestion: remove July
- Abstract, method section; what analysis software was used? How many participants were randomly selected?
- Results: indicate P-value and coefficients.
- Method: who the participants' were selected? Describe more about the sampling method.
- To improve manuscript quality in the introduction and discussion sections, the use of following papers is suggested:
1. Health Care Utilization Inequality in a Mixed Public-Private Health Care System: An Insight from the National Survey in Iran
2. Public Hospital Utilization among Syrian Refugees in Turkey
Best

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 14 Nov 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs Minor Revision.
Sincerely,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 14 Nov 2021

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
Thanks.

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,

Abstract, method section: "during July 2019" OR in 2019. My suggestion: remove July
Addressed

Abstract, method section; what analysis software was used? How many participants were randomly selected?

Addressed. Number of participants was mentioned in the result section of the abstract

Results: indicate P-value and coefficients.
Added

Method: who the participants' were selected? Describe more about the sampling method.
Addressed

To improve manuscript quality in the introduction and discussion sections, the use of following papers is suggested:
1. Health Care Utilization Inequality in a Mixed Public-Private Health Care System: An Insight from the National Survey in Iran
2. Public Hospital Utilization among Syrian Refugees in Turkey
citation of these papers were added to discussion

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) 22 Nov 2021

Dear AE,
Corrections of the manuscript have been done well. This can now be sent to the next step for publishing.
Best

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 22 Nov 2021

Dear EIC,
In the third round, The manuscript entitled "Utilisation of preventive care services at a university hospital in Saudi Arabia" could be published in the journal.
Best

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (2) 23 Nov 2021

Dear Authors,
According to reviewers' comments, Your article has been accepted for publication.
Best Regards