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-120280
Published in: Health Scope: 11(2); e120280

Peer Review Report for "Effectiveness of Interventional Studies on Type 2 Diabetes: A Decade Systematic Review"

Author(s): Ameneh Pooresmaeil Dorosteh, Mohtasham Ghaffari, Sakineh Rakhshanderou

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 12 Jan 2022
Revised Date: 24 Apr 2022
Accepted Date: 18 May 2022

Revision (0)

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

Somayyeh Khazaeian: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 28 Jan 2022

Thanks for your valuable article
It is suggested that the order of articles be written by year of publication
it is suggested that write only the important points in the table and in the results section, the important statistical indicators of articles should be reported.
good luck

Hossein Ansari: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 6 Feb 2022

1-It is better to provide quantitative results of the studies
2-It is better to provide tables more compact. For example, some of the columns could be merged
3-The discussion must be revised. The conclusion must be according to the results of this study and should be applied

Fariba Shahraki Sanavi: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 6 Feb 2022

Dear Author
Abstract:
- Mention the total number of references searched in the method.
- In the method, it should be mentioned that the final 24 references of the article were full text.
- In conclusion, the state which teaching method was more effective and in which group.
Introduction:
- The purpose of the study should be mentioned in the last paragraph.
Methodology:
- Mention the search methodology used.
- Specify the training conditions of the control groups in the studies. Have they received training from other social services (hospitals, health centers, etc.)?
- How did you control the risk of bias in evaluating studies results?
Result:
- Sort the first column of the table by the year of publication.
- Add the age group of the subjects in the columns of the table.
Discussion:
- Enrich the discussion: Difference between the effect of interventions in the patient group with at-risk groups? More effective models? Average changes in teaching methods? In which models have the effects continued the most? Differences in changes in different groups of patients (newly diagnosed or chronic) and ...

Regards

Amir Nasiri: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 7 Feb 2022

This article fits the scope of the Health Scope Journal. The present study aimed to investigate the characteristics and efficacy of the interventions made for type-2 diabetes one decade ago. The topic is so interesting and nowadays, the interventions made on type-2 diabetes issues have been considered one of the main effective variables in public health. It seems that in this article, most of the educational interventions in the field of health have been considered and health promotion interventions such as building healthy public policy, creating supportive environments, strengthening community action, and reorienting health services have not been addressed. The present paper has been written in a well-structured way literature. However, below are some points and suggestions that could improve this article.

Title:
The title is not clear, and your suggested title does not match your Objectives. The author might rewrite the title in an informative way.

Abstract:
The aim of the abstract is not clear. It is highly recommended to rewrite the tile according to the aim of the study. What kind of interventions?
The exclusion criteria for the review are not specified.

The research papers were between 2010 and (January-December) 2020 OR between 2010 and (January-December) 2019. Pay attention to lines 10 and 90.
The methods used to assess the risk of bias are not specified.
Provide a summary of the limitations of the evidence included in the review (e.g. study risk of bias, inconsistency, and imprecision)
Complete keywords. For example: add educational interventions.

Introduction:
The linkage with sentences and paragraphs in this section needs to be elaborated. For example, move the statistics presented in lines 60 to 64 to the appropriate place in the first and second paragraphs.
Are other systematic reviews available that answer the same (or a largely similar) question?

Method:
Eligibility criteria to be reviewed, for example, one of the inclusion criteria is access to the full text.
Please upload the mesh URL link.
Specify the methods (tool, graphical, statistical, or other) used to assess the risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).
The main concern comes, as to how can readers be sure that all eligible articles are included in the study. Explain how the performance of the two researchers who conducted the initial search was monitored.

Results:
Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.
The sentence in the RESULTS needs more clarification. What does the author mean by the “but, changes were not significant in studies that have not worked with theories and models” (Line 153) is this sentence correct?

Discussion
In the part of the design of interventions, the authors discussed the role of a constellation of contributing factors (biological, sociocultural, geographical, and local) in the study on controlling, managing, and preventing type 2 diabetes it is an interesting issue that needs more clarification.
In the part of The Interventions description, Be explained health promotion interventions such as building healthy public policy, creating supportive environments, strengthening community action, and reorienting health services have not been addressed.

Fariba Shahraki Sanavi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 8 Feb 2022

Reviewers' Comments:
Dear Authors
Reviewer 1:
1-It is better to provide quantitative results of the studies
2-It is better to provide tables more compact. For example, some of the columns could be merged

3-The discussion must be revised. The conclusion must be according to the results of this study and should be applied

Reviewer 2:

Thanks for your valuable article

It is suggested that the order of articles be written by year of publication

it is suggested that write only the important points in the table and in the results section, the important statistical indicators of articles should be reported.

Reviewer 3:

Abstract:

- Mention the total number of references searched in the method.
- In the method, it should be mentioned that the final 24 references of the article were full text.
- In conclusion, the state which teaching method was more effective and in which group.

Introduction:

- The purpose of the study should be mentioned in the last paragraph.

Methodology:

- Mention the search methodology used.
- Specify the training conditions of the control groups in the studies. Have they received training from other social services (hospitals, health centers, etc.)?
- How did you control the risk of bias in evaluating studies results?

Result:

- Sort the first column of the table by the year of publication.
- Add the age group of the subjects in the columns of the table.

Discussion:

- Enrich the discussion: Difference between the effect of interventions in the patient group with at-risk groups? More effective models? Average changes in teaching methods? In which models have the effects continued the most? Differences in changes in different groups of patients (newly diagnosed or chronic) and ...

Reviewer 4:

This article fits the scope of the Health Scope Journal. The present study aimed to investigate the characteristics and efficacy of the interventions made for type-2 diabetes one decade ago. The topic is so interesting and nowadays, the interventions made on type-2 diabetes issues have been considered one of the main effective variables in public health. It seems that in this article, most of the educational interventions in the field of health have been considered and health promotion interventions such as building healthy public policy, creating supportive environments, strengthening community action, and reorienting health services have not been addressed. The present paper has been written in a well-structured way literature. However, below are some points and suggestions that could improve this article.

Title:

The title is not clear, and your suggested title does not match your Objectives. The author might rewrite the title in an informative way.

Abstract:

The aim of the abstract is not clear. It is highly recommended to rewrite the tile according to the aim of the study. What kind of interventions?

The exclusion criteria for the review are not specified.

The research papers were between 2010 and (January-December) 2020 OR between 2010 and (January-December) 2019. Pay attention to lines 10 and 90.
The methods used to assess the risk of bias are not specified.
Provide a summary of the limitations of the evidence included in the review (e.g. study risk of bias, inconsistency, and imprecision)
Complete keywords. For example: add educational interventions.
Introduction:
The linkage with sentences and paragraphs in this section needs to be elaborated. For example, move the statistics presented in lines 60 to 64 to the appropriate place in the first and second paragraphs.
Are other systematic reviews available that answer the same (or a largely similar) question?
Method:
Eligibility criteria to be reviewed, for example, one of the inclusion criteria is access to the full text.
Please upload the mesh URL link.
Specify the methods (tool, graphical, statistical, or other) used to assess the risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).
The main concern comes, as to how can readers be sure that all eligible articles are included in the study. Explain how the performance of the two researchers who conducted the initial search was monitored.
Results:
Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.
The sentence in the RESULTS needs more clarification. What does the author mean by the “but, changes were not significant in studies that have not worked with theories and models” (Line 153) is this sentence correct?
Discussion
In the part of the design of interventions, the authors discussed the role of a constellation of contributing factors (biological, sociocultural, geographical, and local) in the study on controlling, managing, and preventing type 2 diabetes it is an interesting issue that needs more clarification.
In the part of The Interventions description, Be explained health promotion interventions such as building healthy public policy, creating supportive environments, strengthening community action, and reorienting health services have not been addressed.
Regards

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision (0)** 10 Feb 2022

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.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
This article fits the scope of the Health Scope Journal. The present study aimed to investigate the characteristics and efficacy of the interventions made for type-2 diabetes one decade ago. The topic is so interesting and nowadays, the interventions made on type-2 diabetes issues have been considered one of the main effective variables in public health. It seems that in this article, most of the educational interventions in the field of health have been considered and health promotion interventions such as building healthy public policy, creating supportive environments, strengthening community action, and reorienting health services have not been addressed. The present paper has been written in a well-structured way literature. However, below are some points and suggestions that could improve this article.

Title:

Was corrected

Abstract:
It was rewritten

The exclusion criteria for the review are not specified.
It is given in the main text of the article (abstract) and highlighted

The research papers were between 2010 and (January-December) 2020 OR between 2010 and (January-December) 2019. Pay attention to lines 10 and 90.

2010 and (January-December) 2019
It is given in the main text of the article and highlighted
The methods used to assess the risk of bias are not specified.

Provide a summary of the limitations of the evidence included in the review (e.g. study risk of bias, inconsistency, and imprecision)
The main purpose of searching sources and databases in conducting systematic review studies is to identify and retrieve all published studies on the relevant subject. However, the results of many types of research are never published, or they are published late or they are only presented at conferences, and the studies that are published also tend to overestimate the effectiveness of interventions and underestimate the harms of interventions.
Therefore, the evaluation of published articles may not represent the entire research conducted on each topic. To reduce the risk of reporting bias and publication in systematic reviews, unpublished materials, and reports should be

searched, which was not possible for researchers.
Reporting bias, and language bias are limitations of the study. To prevent bias caused by the selection of search sources (database bias), researchers tried to use many common databases to search for articles

Complete keywords. For example: add educational interventions.
In the keywords section, the main text of the article is given and highlighted

Introduction:
The linkage with sentences and paragraphs in this section needs to be elaborated. For example, move the statistics presented in lines 60 to 64 to the appropriate place in the first and second paragraphs.
The desired lines were moved to the second paragraph and highlighted

Are other systematic reviews available that answer the same (or a largely similar) question? no

Method:
Eligibility criteria to be reviewed, for example, one of the inclusion criteria is access to the full text.

In some articles only their abstracts are available. In this study, the articles whose full text was available are given
Please upload the mesh URL link.
URL:https://meshb.nlm.nih.gov/search?searchMethod=FullWord&searchInField=ui&sort=&size=20&searchType=exactMatch&from=0&q=Diabetes%20Mellitus

Specify the methods (tool, graphical, statistical, or other) used to assess the risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).
The main concern comes, as to how can readers be sure that all eligible articles are included in the study.

The articles were included in the study based on the checklist related to the type of study (experimental, semi-experimental, quasi-experimental, before and after, and clinical trial) and the score obtained (over 70%) from each checklist

Explain how the performance of the two researchers who conducted the initial search was monitored.
First, the initial search was done by two authors A.P) & S.R) separately. In the next step, duplicate articles were removed, then more limited searches were performed to remove unrelated items. After reviewing the summary and title of each study and eligibility criteria, possible articles were identified. The full text of the articles was reviewed by two authors (A.P) & S.R) and discussed until reaching a consensus. Finally, the reviewed articles were monitored and evaluated by the third author (M.GH)Results:
Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.
The sentence in the RESULTS needs more clarification. What does the author mean by the “but, changes were not significant in studies that have not worked with theories and models” (Line 153) is this sentence correct? This section was rewritten and highlighted in the main text of the article

Discussion
In the part of the design of interventions, the authors discussed the role of a constellation of contributing factors (biological, sociocultural, geographical, and local) in the study on controlling, managing, and preventing type 2 diabetes it is an interesting issue that needs more clarification.
This section was rewritten and highlighted in the main text of the article

In the part of The Interventions description, Be explained health promotion interventions such as building healthy public policy, creating supportive environments, strengthening community action, and reorienting health services have not been addressed.
The role of health education and health promotion interventions was discussed and added in the description of interventions section and highlighted in the main text of the article

Reviewer 2:
1-It is better to provide quantitative results of the studies
Our study is only a systematic review and not a meta-analysis

2-It is better to provide tables more compact. For example, some of the columns could be merged
Corrected and highlighted

3-The discussion must be revised.
The conclusion must be according to the results of this study and should be applied
The conclusion was revised and revised and highlighted in the main text of the article

Reviewer 3:
Thanks for your valuable article
It is suggested that the order of articles be written by year of publication

The order of the articles based on the year of publication is given in the first column of the table and highlighted

it is suggested that write only the important points in the table and in the results section, the important statistical indicators of articles should be reported.
The table was modified and the important statistical indicators of the articles were given in the results section and highlighted
good luck

Reviewer 4:

Dear Author
Abstract:
- Mention the total number of references searched in the method**.**
It is mentioned in the abstract section and highlighted

- In the method, it should be mentioned that the final 24 references of the article were full text.
It was corrected and highlighted in the main text of the article

In conclusion, the state which teaching method was more effective and in which group.
Considering the different types of studies included in this research (experimental, semi-experimental, quasi-experimental, before and after, and clinical trial) and that each study had a different type of measurement tool and target group, it is possible to compare the studies more effectively. There is no teaching method. But in general, studies based on theories and models were more effective introductions:
- The purpose of the study should be mentioned in the last paragraph.
The purpose of the study is given in the last paragraph of the introduction and highlighted in the main text of the article
Methodology:
- Mention the search methodology used.
The search strategy is highlighted in the main text of the article

- Specify the training conditions of the control groups in the studies. Have they received training from other social services (hospitals, health centers, etc.)?
The educational conditions of the control groups were reported in the table and highlighted
- How did you control the risk of bias in evaluating studies results?
Result:
- Sort the first column of the table by the year of publication.
The first column of the table is sorted by year of publication and highlighted

- Add the age group of the subjects in the columns of the table.
The age group of the subjects was added in the columns of the table and highlighted
Discussion:
- Enrich the discussion: Difference between the effect of interventions in the patient group with at-risk groups? More effective models? Average changes in teaching methods? In which models

have the effects continued the most? Differences in changes in different groups of patients (newly diagnosed or chronic) and ...
Considering the different types of studies included in this research (experimental, semi-experimental, quasi-experimental, before and after, and clinical trial) and that each study had a different type of measurement tool and target group, it is possible to compare the studies more effectively. There is no teaching method

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.

Somayyeh Khazaeian: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 15 Mar 2022

Hello
Respectfully, several points should be mentioned in connection with the present study.
1. The principles of writing a systematic review should be observed.
2. In the table of articles, it should be sorted by year from new to old
3. The question of this research should be correctly defined. If your review is a review of interventions over a decade, is the purpose of examining changes in the field of interventions and improvement or weakness of the type of interventions.
4. The variety of types of studies helps to improve your conclusion in the review of effective interventions. Please be more careful in writing the conclusion and discussion

Hossein Ansari: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 21 Mar 2022

The authors have revised the manuscript based on the reviewers' comments.

Amir Nasiri: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 1 Apr 2022

I commend the authors for making corrections to the article. The study does have weaknesses in the method section, and the manuscript could be helped with significantly better editing.

Title:
The title is not clear. This study does not cover a variety of intervention methods.

Introduction
Comments:
a. The research team intended to design an intervention study for type-2 diabetes (line 81).

b. The purpose of this study is to survey what kind of interventions?
• “aimed at a systematic review of the preventive interventions made in Iran and the world” (line 82)
• Survey of the Effectiveness of Multiple Types of Interventional Studies on Type 2 Diabetes (title)
• Educational interventions for type 2 diabetes can have life-saving effects. (Abstract)

• What is the impact of health education and health promotion interventions on controlling, managing, and preventing type 2 diabetes? (Study question)

c. are you sure: other systematic reviews are not available that answer the same (or a largely similar) question?

Methods
Comments:
a. The methods used to assess the risk of bias are not specified. The description is not convincing.

b. the mesh URL link is incorrect

c. Explain how the performance of the two researchers who conducted the initial search was monitored. In particular, a description of the duties of the Third Author (M.GH) should be added to the Methods section.

Discussion and Conclusions
Comments:
a. You should have comprehensive and reliable comparisons between your findings with the other previous studies.

Fariba Shahraki Sanavi: Associate Editor | **Revision (1)** 6 Apr 2022

Dear Authors
Reviewer 1:
1. The principles of writing a systematic review should be observed.
2. Arrange the table of articles by year from new to old
3. The question of this research is to correctly identify if your study is a review of interventions over a decade, the purpose of examining changes in the field of interventions, and the improvement or weakness of the type of interventions.
4. The variety of studies helps to improve your conclusions in reviewing effective interventions. Please be more careful in writing conclusions and discussions.
Reviewer 2:
Title:
The title is not clear. This study does not cover a variety of intervention methods.
Introduction:
a. The research team intended to design an intervention study for type-2 diabetes (line 81).
b. The purpose of this study is to survey what kind of interventions?
• “aimed at a systematic review of the preventive interventions made in Iran and the world” (line 82)
• Survey of the Effectiveness of Multiple Types of Interventional Studies on Type 2 Diabetes (title)
• Educational interventions for type 2 diabetes can have life-saving effects. (Abstract)
• What is the impact of health education and health promotion interventions on controlling,

managing, and preventing type 2 diabetes? (Study question)
c. are you sure: other systematic reviews are not available that answer the same (or a largely similar) question?
Method:
a. The methods used to assess the risk of bias are not specified. The description is not convincing.
b. the mesh URL link is incorrect.
c. Explain how the performance of the two researchers who conducted the initial search was monitored. In particular, a description of the duties of the Third Author (M.GH) should be added to the Methods section.
Discussion
a. You should have comprehensive and reliable comparisons between your findings with the other previous studies.
AE:
Spend more time responding to reviewers. There should be harmony between the contents of the different sections of the manuscript. There is a discrepancy between the title, abstract, purpose, and research question mentioned.
Method: State the process that will be used for selecting studies through each phase of the review. Moreover, describe anticipated methods for assessing the risk of bias.
Conclusion: This section should not be a repetition of research findings. In this section, the final summary of the findings should be stated along with the recommendations, applications of the findings section, or the results.
Regards

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision (1)** 6 Apr 2022

Dear Author

According to reviewer comments, the manuscript need “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.

reviewer 1:
Dear authors
reviewer 1:
1. The principles of writing a systematic review should be observed.
• The principles of systematic review writing are followed: the title is self-explanatory and does not contain extra words. The abstract is structured. The introduction is written in a concise, clear, purposeful, and orderly manner and the topic and field of research are explained in general. More specific explanations about the problem of type 2 diabetes are given. Also, the void and gap in type 2 diabetes have been discussed in line with the necessity of conducting the present study and its purpose. In the materials and methods section, the research question, the search method and strategy, the searched words, the languages of the searched articles, the time range of the search, the entry and exit criteria, the method of selecting articles, the strategy of removing articles, the method of analysis and the method of evaluating the articles were mentioned. In the findings section, the interpretation of the findings is based on scientific standards, and the data and findings are presented in tables and graphs based on the year, authors and place of the study, type of study, theory and model, purpose, age, sample size, duration of follow-up, The content of the intervention, the results and the points obtained (percentage) are set. It has been discussed in the discussion section on the findings and in different sections, and since no similar study has been conducted, it has not been compared with the results of other review articles or large studies in the researched field.

2. Sort the table of articles by year from new to old: sorted by year.
3. The question of this research is to correctly identify whether your study is a review of interventions over a decade, the purpose of which is to examine changes in the context of interventions and the improvement or weakness of the type of interventions. The research question is: What is the effect of the types of interventions performed in the field of type 2 diabetes on the control, management, and prevention of type 2 diabetes?

4. The diversity of studies helps improve your conclusions when examining effective interventions. Please be more careful in writing conclusions and discussions.
The conclusion and discussion are written based on the findings.
Referee 2:
Title:
The title is not clear. This study does not cover all types of intervention methods.
Introduction:
A. The research team planned to design an interventional study for type 2 diabetes (line 81).

b. What kind of interventions is the purpose of this study?
• "With the aim of a systematic review of preventive interventions carried out in Iran and the world" (line 82)
• Investigating the effectiveness of various types of interventional studies on type 2 diabetes (title)
• Educational interventions for type 2 diabetes can have life-saving effects. (Summary)
• What is the effect of health education and health promotion interventions on the control, management, and prevention of type 2 diabetes? (study question)
Was corrected.
Study title:

Survey of the Effectiveness of Multiple Types of Interventional Studies on Type 2 Diabetes: A Decade Systematic Review

Evaluation of the effectiveness of different types of interventional studies on type 2 diabetes: a decade of systematic review

Objective: To investigate the effectiveness of various interventional studies on type 2 diabetes during the past decade in Iran and the world

C Are you sure: No other systematic reviews that answer the same (or very similar) question are available.
During extensive initial searches, we are quite sure that no other study with the same title as the present study has been conducted.
Method:
A. Methods used to assess the risk of bias were not specified. The description is not convincing.

Methods used to reduce the risk of bias:
1. Database bias
To prevent bias caused by the selection of search sources (database bias), researchers have used many common databases such as PubMed, Science Direct and Scopus, Web of Science, Google scholar, SID, and Magiran to search for articles.
2. Citation bias
Since the articles were searched and selected based on the keywords and title of the study and based on the methodology and principles of writing a systematic review, there was no bias.
3. Reporting bias
The main purpose of searching sources and databases in conducting systematic review studies is to identify and retrieve all published studies on the relevant subject. However, the results of many types of research are never published, or they are published late or they are only presented at conferences, and the

studies that are published also tend to overestimate the effectiveness of interventions and underestimate the harms of interventions. Therefore, the evaluation of published articles may not represent the entire research conducted on each topic. To reduce the risk of reporting bias and publication in systematic reviews, unpublished materials, and reports should be searched, which was not possible for researchers.
4. Language Bias
Since the authors of the article are fluent in two languages, i.e. Farsi and English, researchers couldn't search for articles in languages other than Persian and English.
Reporting bias and language bias are limitations of the study.

B. The mesh URL link is incorrect.
(MeSH): http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/meshhome.html

(c) Explain how the performance of the two researchers who conducted the initial search was monitored.
All extracted articles and sources and search methods and databases as well as the final articles selected by the third author (M.GH) were fully reviewed and monitored and evaluated. In particular, a description of the duties of the third author (M.GH) should be added to the Methods section.
It was modified and highlighted in the original file of the article.
Discuss
A. You should make comprehensive and reliable comparisons between your findings and other previous studies.
Since a similar study has not been conducted in Iran and the world with the title of the present study, it has not been compared with the results of other review articles or large studies in the researched field, and the findings have been discussed in different sections.

AE:
Allow more time to respond to reviewers. There should be harmony between the contents of different parts of the manuscript. There is a discrepancy between the title, abstract, objective, and research question mentioned.
Was corrected.
Method: Describe the process that will be used to select studies at each stage of the review.
The study selection process was explained in the Study selection section. In addition, this section was also modified and highlighted.
Additionally, describe the anticipated methods for assessing the risk of bias.
Methods used to reduce the risk of bias:
1. Bias caused by the selection of search sources (Database bias)
To prevent bias caused by the selection of search sources (database bias), researchers have used many common databases such as PubMed, Science

Direct and Scopus, Web of Science, Google scholar, SID, and Magiran to search for articles.

2. Citation bias

Since the articles were searched and selected based on the keywords and title of the study and based on the methodology and principles of writing a systematic review, there was no bias.

3. Reporting bias

The main purpose of searching sources and databases in conducting systematic review studies is to identify and retrieve all published studies on the relevant subject. However, the results of many types of research are never published, or they are published late or they are only presented at conferences, and the studies that are published also tend to overestimate the effectiveness of interventions and underestimate the harms of interventions.

Therefore, the evaluation of published articles may not represent the entire research conducted on each topic. To reduce the risk of reporting bias and publication in systematic reviews, unpublished materials, and reports should be searched, which was not possible for researchers.

4. Language Bias

Since the authors of the article are fluent in two languages, i.e. Farsi and English, researchers couldn't search for articles in languages other than Persian and English.

Reporting bias and language bias are limitations of the study.

Conclusion: This section should not repeat the research findings. In this section, the final summary of the findings should be stated along with the recommendations, the applications of the findings, or the results.

This section starts with a general conclusion and suggestions based on the results of the study are presented.

With respect

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.

Somayyeh Khazaeian: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) — 30 Apr 2022

Thanks
Corrections have made

Hossein Ansari: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) — 8 May 2022

The authors have revised the manuscript based on the reviewers' comments

Amir Nasiri: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) — 14 May 2022

Changes have been made

Fariba Shahraki Sanavi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) — 16 May 2022

The authors have revised the manuscript based on reviewers' comments.

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (2) — 18 May 2022

Dear Author

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