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.121232
Published in: Health Scope: 11(2); e121232

Peer Review Report for "Rabies: Repetition of an Old Tragic Story in Southeastern Iran"

Author(s): Jalil Nejati, Mehdi Zanganeh Baygi, Said Salemroudi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 19 Nov 2021
Revised Date: 27 Dec 2021
Accepted Date: 7 Jan 2022

Revision (0)

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

Hossein Ansari: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 22 Nov 2021

It is better to mention practical suggestions to solve this problem locally and nationally

Eshagh Barfar: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 29 Nov 2021

Dear Associate Editor,
The manuscript needs minor revisions as follows:
1. Mention the possible reasons for the significant increase in the frequency of animal bites in 2021.
2. It seems that the first line of the last paragraph needs to be revised.
3. It is suggested to use the following paper:
Abbasi M, Barfar E, Hazratian T, Abbasi R. Estimating the Cost of Prevention and Control of Rabies: A Case Study in the Northwest of Iran. EBHPME. 2018; 2 (3):166-173.

Best Regards

Hossein Ansari: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 11 Dec 2021

Reviewer 1 :

Dear Associate Editor,

The manuscript needs minor revisions as follows:

1. Mention the possible reasons for the significant increase in the frequency of animal bites in 2021.

2. It seems that the first line of the last paragraph needs to be revised.

3. It is suggested to use the following paper:

Abbasi M, Barfar E, Hazratian T, Abbasi R. Estimating the Cost of Prevention and Control of Rabies: A Case Study in the Northwest of Iran. EBHPME. 2018; 2 (3):166-173.

Best Regards

Reviewer 2:

It is better to mention practical suggestions to solve this problem locally and nationally

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (0) 14 Dec 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 Reviewer,

Let me thank you for giving me the time to study our manuscript.

Reviewer 1:
Thanks for your comment. It should be mentioned that the practical suggestions to solve this problem have been concluded in the penultimate paragraph. Unfortunately, the authors can not add a new suggestion.

Reviewer 2:
Thanks for your valuable comments.

1. The possible reasons for the significant increase in the frequency of animal bites in 2021, were added in the sixth paragraph.
2. Based on your valuable comment, the first line of the last paragraph needs to be revised.
3. The mentioned paper: Abbasi M, Barfar E, Hazratian T,… was added to the references.

You can find the revised manuscript (with red words) based on your valuable comments.

Yours 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.

Hossein Ansari: Associate Editor | **Revision** (**1**) 1 Jan 2022

Dear EIC
This article has been edited based on the opinions of the reviewers and can be published in this journal.

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (**1**) 7 Jan 2022

Dear Author

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