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-121471
Published in: Health Scope: 11(2); e121471

Peer Review Report for "Designing a Driver's Hazard Perception Test Based on the Neural Brain Images Analysis (fMRI)"

Author(s): Seifollah Gharib, Mina Mahmoudi, Zahra Rezvani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 5 Dec 2021
Revised Date: 7 Mar 2022
Accepted Date: 6 Apr 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) — 12 Jan 2022

1. Explain the reason for choosing this number of samples in two steps
2. How to have the authors evaluated the normality of data
3. The title of all tables should be revised a completed based on the title of the study
4. The discussion should be written based on the main and applied results of the study

Maryam Hormozi: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 17 Jan 2022

Manuscript ID: 121471 entitled " Designing a driver's hazard perception test based on the neural brain images analysis (fMRI)." which was submitted to the Journal of Health Scope, was reviewed. The comments of the reviewer are included at the bottom of this letter.

Comments to the Author:

- The manuscript requires English language edits.
In the Background section:
- In the text of the article, numbers (all as numbers) and percentages (all as percent or %)

should be written in the same way, for example, you said “1 million and thirty-five thousand people”, 15,396 abnormal deaths, %90 percent, 50%, 52.1 percent, Fifty-six percent. Please correct these mistakes.

- Please remove the sub-headings in the Background section, i.e. “1.1 Driver accident models and 1.2 Driving HPT”

• Methods:

In the Participants section:

- The place and time of study are not clear.
- How were the study participants selected? Clarify whether the participants were male or female or both.
- In the inclusion criteria for participation, it was better to include having a full driving license for a minimum of one year and/or ten years.
- How was the sample size calculated? Please also explain the sampling method.
- The ethics approval code has not been mentioned.

In the Driving hazard perception videos section:

- Filming time occurred in what month and year, in day or night (e.g., during daylight hours), under what weather (e.g., under clear skies), road conditions (e.g., dry roadway) and, in different road environments (e.g., urban roads intercity, and rural roads). I suggest adding these to this section.
- What do you mean by error rate? Did you mean the “accuracy” of the test?
- What method did you use to model the hazard perception test, so that it could provide a reliable and valid measure of collision risk in both novice and older drivers? Please add a reference to this section.
- You have said that “Validity and reliability were performed in three steps. Please report internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha) of HPT for each of the 64, 35, and,18 clips.
- It is better to use the word “conflict” instead of “collision” in the text of the article.
- According to the objective of the study, “Traffic conflict” should be defined.

In the statistical analysis section:

1. Statistical analysis should be revised according to the current study variables.

In the result section:

1. In Figure.1, I suggest listing the types of traffic conflicts represented by the 35 conflict scenes (videos) of the HPT in both stages. For example, in each stage, you can show the percentage of videos that contained a traffic conflict, and /or contained no traffic conflicts.
2. In Table 1; the unit of measurement of variables such as number (e.g., n=50), units of Age (e.g., years); Visual acuity (e.g., Log MAR); Vision sensitivity (e.g., SF = spatial frequency in cycles per degree of visual angle) and, Color vision should be corrected.
3. In Table 2, it is necessary to report types of traffic conflicts in each analyzed clip in terms of number (percentage) and corrected according to: “In 64 clips n (%)”
4. The statistical analysis method used for the P-value should be listed below in Table 1.
5. Choose Figure 2 with the best contrast.
6. What do you mean by “18.34% and 37%” in this sentence: “In the first stage, the average error rate of novice drivers was 35.41 ± 18. 18.34%, while the average error rate of

experienced drivers was 16.39 ± 10.37%".
7. In the Results section of the text, you should avoid repeating the mean values of the variables whose data are listed in the supporting tables. Just state that the differences were "significant." It is necessary to summarize the results section.

In the Discussion section:
- More recent published papers (recent 2-3 years) should be cited.
- In the Conclusion section, you said "The present study was carried out to design a driving HPT based on fMRI", The data overall are not sufficient to support the conclusion. Aside from the issue of validity, if used in applied settings where decisions (e.g., driver's license) are based on test performance, the authors should report the internal consistency acceptable level as indices of reliability in the obtained score of HPT.
- Moreover, I suggest the authors should assess the relationship between risk perception scores and accident risk. The authors need to make the strongest case they can with the data available and make clear what are the limitations of the study. I think there are major limitations to this study that should be included in the Discussion.

Mohammad Khammarnia: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 18 Jan 2022

Dear Editor,
The manuscript entitled" Designing a driver's hazard perception test based on the neural brain images analysis (fMRI)" needs Major Revision.
Best,

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (0) 27 Jan 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.

Answers to the comments

Manuscript ID: *121471*

Title: *Designing a driver's hazard perception test based on the neural brain images analysis (fMRI)*

Based on the reviewer's comments the paper is revised accordingly. The list of the reactions concerning the comments is as follows. The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to the editor-in-chief and the respectful reviewers whose insightful suggestions enhanced the quality of the paper.

Reactions to the comments of Reviewer#1:

After many thanks for the reviewer's excellent comments, the responses are as follows.

Comment 1.

The manuscript requires English language edits. In the Background section:

- In the text of the article, numbers (all as numbers) and percentages (all as percent or %) should be written in the same way, for example, you said "1 million and thirty-five thousand people", 15,396 abnormal deaths, %90 percent, 50%, 52.1 percent, Fifty-six percent. Please correct these mistakes.

Reaction

Thanks for this comment. We checked the manuscript in total and revised the manuscript. We also followed your comments and wrote the numbers in the same way (numeric). We also changed some numbers to the percentages in the background section to be more tangible, paragraph2 is as follows now:

Iranian legal medicine organization reported 0.33% injuries and 0.00184% deaths due to traffic accidents in 2021. The annual average of deaths and injuries as a result of road accidents were 17,226.5 and 320,987.5 respectively over the last 10 years ten years (from 2010 to 2020 (4). Investigations in this domain show that 75% of traffic accidents are caused by driver errors (5). 40% of road accidents occur for novice drivers who have been licensed for less than a year (6). These data indicate that existing controls on the risk of unsafe behavior in Iran are not effective enough and focusing on safe driving behaviors can be the best strategy to prevent traffic accidents in this country."

Comment 2.

Please remove the sub-headings in the Background section, i.e. "1.1 Driver accident models

Reaction

Thanks for this comment. We removed the subheadings in the background.

Comment 3.

In the Participants section:

The place and time of study are not clear.

Reaction

Thanks for this comment. We corrected the text in this way:

"*In the first stage of this study, a sample of Iranian licensed drivers were chosen from Tehran and Mashhad (two biggest cities in this country) between 2020 and 2021."*

Comment 4.

How were the study participants selected?

Reaction

Thanks for this comment. We add a sentence in the participant part to apply your comments.

"Participants were selected based on responding to a public advertisement in a university's faculties, driving schools, and social media. Initially, 183 subjects (112 novices and 71 experienced drivers) agreed to participate, after explaining the study procedure to them."

Comment 5.

Clarify whether the participants were male or female or both.

Reaction

Thank you for your comment. We clarified the text in this way:

"The novice drivers included 39 males and 11 females; while, the experienced group contained 40 males and 10 females. The novice drivers with a mean age of (23.46 ± 4.84) had more than 6 months and less than one year of driving experience, while, the experienced drivers (mean age 37.74 ± 6.35) had 10 years or more of driving experience.
For the next stage, only male drivers, 15 novice drivers (22.13 ± 2.38) and 16 experienced drivers (41.44 ± 5.83) participated in the fMRI risk perception task test voluntarily."

Comment 6.

In the inclusion criteria for participation, it was better to include having a full driving license for a minimum of one year and/or ten years.

Reaction

Thanks for this comment. We corrected the two parts of the text to clarify the inclusion criteria.

First:

"The novice drivers with a mean age of (23.46 ± 4.84) had more than six months and less than one year of driving experience, while, the experienced drivers (mean age 37.74 ± 6.35) had ten years or more of driving experience."

Second:

"*Inclusion criteria were normal vision (without glasses or corrected with glasses), visual acuity and sensitivity, normal sleep and no alcohol consumption in the last 24 hours, a minimum of 6 months' period of driving license acquisition for novice drivers and more than ten years of driving license acquisition for experienced drivers.*"

Comment 7.

How was the sample size calculated? Please also explain the sampling method.

Reaction

Thanks for this fruitful comment. We explained the calculation of the sample size as follows:

*"G*Power software (version 3, 1) was used to calculate the sample size. Based on the purpose of this study, the difference between two independent means (two groups) tests was selected among the statistical tests. The input parameters included the effect size d = 0.8; α err. Prob. = 0.05; power (1-β err. Prob.) = 0.95, and allocation ratio N2/N1 = 1 in the software. Consequently, the sample size of each group was obtained as 42 samples. Consequently, the calculated sample size for each group was 42. By considering the sample drop, the sample size for each group of novice and experienced drivers was 50 participants."*

Comment 8.

The ethics approval code has not been mentioned

Reaction

Thanks for this comment. We add the ethics approval code in the last part of participants (section 3.1)

"The study was approved by the IRCCS MUMS Ethics Committee, and all the participants signed written informed consent. (Ethics code: IR.MUMS.FHMPM.REC.1400.089"

Comment 9.

In the Driving hazard perception videos section:
- Filming time occurred in what month and year, in day or night (e.g., during daylight hours), under what weather (e.g., under clear skies), road conditions (e.g., dry roadway) and, in different road environments (e.g., urban roads intercity, and rural roads). I suggest adding these to this section.

Reaction

Thanks for this comment. We did your comment as follows:

"A full HD portable digital car camera with high resolution (1920 x 1080) was installed inside a sedan vehicle on the windscreen of the car in the driver's visual angles. Then, different roads

in the three provinces of Tehran, Razavi Khorasan, and Mazandaran including urban roads intercity, and rural roads were filmed from April 2020 to September 2020. All the records were performed during daylight hours, generally under a clear sky and dry roadway conditions in different environments (e.g., streets, rural roads, residential ways, and limited highway access). In total, filming took place for 100 hours. Among them, a 150-minute set of silent video clips were picked up in which a driver had to perform an emergency reaction such as slowing down, stopping, and turning left or right. This step of the study was carried out based on the most important psychological features of the risk perception test developed by Scialfa and Horswill (29, 30)(29)."

Comment 10.

What do you mean by error rate? Did you mean the "accuracy" of the test?

Reaction

Thanks for this comment. Error rate does not have any relationship with the accuracy of the test in this manuscript; instead, error rate or miss rate of video/s means the percentage of missing the hazard scenes of the videos by novice or experienced drivers. We add this explanation in the driving hazard perception videos section in this way:

In this step, 64 short clips from 5 risk sources were selected by consulting 8 risk perception experts and behavioral psychologists. Drivers watched the clips, and the error rate - the percentage of missing the hazard scenes of the videos, and the reaction time of drivers from two groups in hazardous situations were measured for 64 videos.

Comment 11.

What method did you use to model the hazard perception test, so that it could provide a reliable and valid measure of collision risk in both novice and older drivers? Please add a reference to this section.

Reaction

Thanks for this comment. We revised the manuscript as follows:

Some scholars found a relationship between traffic accidents and risk perception scores that were examined and confirmed by different tests in different countries (31-34). Besides, Congdon (1999) and Wells (2008) accentuated the prospective relationship between risk perception test scores and the risk of traffic accidents (36, 37). Horswill stated that hazard perception scores can predict active traffic accidents - non-park or fixed obstacles - for up to one year (38). Moreover, there was a statistically significant relationship between reaction time in the hazard perception tests and driving skills in predicting, paying attention, and safety on public roads (42, 66-68). Therefore, these studies support the fact that hazard perception tests can predict the risk of accidents and traffic accidents to some extent in real conditions.

Other studies confirmed that there is a significant difference between the risk scores of novice and experienced drivers and attributed to greater awareness of the situations of inexperienced drivers (17, 18, 20- 26, 35, 45, 70). Risk perception skill is commonly used conceptually as

situation awareness. Situation awareness means a driver who scores higher on the risk perception test has a better representation of the observed traffic environment and can actively use this mental representation to predict possible outcomes in any situation. Risk perception skills are also likened to read-the-road skills, in the sense that drivers who are skilled in risk perception can detect and pay attention to the warning signs of a hazardous situation. It allows them to actively identify potentially hazardous situations and react to them earlier (25).”

Comment 12.

You have said that “Validity and reliability were performed in three steps. Please report internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha) of HPT for each of the 64, 35, and,18 clips.

Reaction

Thanks for this comment. In this study, we just do the validity procedure of the test. So we checked the paper and corrected the phrase “Validity and reliability “(we omitted the word “reliability”) and the validity of the study was determined according to first, matching the scenarios of the hazard perception test with assessed accident scenarios on different roads including urban, main roads, highways, freeway, intercity, and rural roads. Second, the significant differences between the performances of novice and experienced drivers in the hazard perception test which was done in three steps. Finally, the selection of final videos was based on three criteria which were differences in mean error rate, reaction time, and neural brain function.

Regarding internal consistency, the hazard perception test is not a questionnaire, so we have not seen a determined Cronbach’s alpha for HPT in previous studies. As we mentioned before, all the video clips were designed based on various traffic accidents that are scored according to the decision to react and reaction time. In other words, it does not need any internal consistency.

Comment 13.

- It is better to use the word “conflict” instead of “collision” in the text of the article.
- According to the objective of the study, “Traffic conflict” should be defined.

Reaction

Thanks for this precise comment; however, in this context, collision is more proper because

“*A traffic conflict is an observable event which would end in an accident unless one of the involved parties slows down, changes lanes, or accelerates to avoid collision"*

In the text, we mentioned that Figure 1 presents the various groups of traffic collisions based on accident data that resulted in fatalities and injuries. So, collision is more proper than conflict.

We also defined the traffic conflict based on a previously mentioned reference in the text as follows:

> *“Table 3 shows the classification of traffic conflicts which are noticeable events that would lead to an unacceptable consequence/s unless one of the involved parties reacts to avoid collision such as slowing down, changing the direction, or accelerating*
>
> *(according to the references: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Traffic_conflict; Riser, R.(1985). Behavior in traffic conflict situations. Accident Analysis and Prevention. 17. 179-197. Page*

180; and Zheng, Lai, Karim Ismail, and Xianghai Meng. "Traffic conflict techniques for road safety analysis: open questions and some insights." Canadian journal of civil engineering 41.7 (2014): 633-641.)

Comment 14.

In the statistical analysis section:
1. Statistical analysis should be revised according to the current study variables.

Reaction

Thanks for this comment. We revised the statistical analysis section as follows:

"SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) software version 22 was applied for analyzing the data. Descriptive statistics such as mean, standard deviation, and frequency distribution were applied to describe the demographic characteristics of two groups of novice and experienced drivers. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to determine the normality of the data. Since the data were normal (p>0.05), then parametric tests were used to analyze the data. The Independent-Samples T-Test for P-value < 0.05 was utilized to analyze the differences between the two groups in variables including age, education, visual acuity and sensitivity, visual attention, weekly driving distance, miss rate, and reaction time. Besides, the miss rate of two groups in various traffic conflicts was examined by the Independent-Samples T-Test for P-value < 0.05."

Comment 15.

In Figure.1, I suggest listing the types of traffic conflicts represented by the 35 conflict scenes (videos) of the HPT in both stages. For example, in each stage, you can show the percentage of videos that contained a traffic conflict, and /or contained no traffic conflicts.

Reaction

Thanks for this comment. In Figure 1, we presented the results of the accident data, one essential part of the results because we need this information to show the validation of the results of the hazard perception test.

Comment 16.

In Table 1; the unit of measurement of variables such as number (e.g., n=50), units of Age (e.g., years); Visual acuity (e.g., Log MAR); Vision sensitivity (e.g., SF = spatial frequency in cycles per degree of visual angle) and, Color vision should be corrected.

Reaction

Thanks for this comment. We did it.

Comment 17.

. In Table 2, it is necessary to report types of traffic conflicts in each analyzed clip in terms of number (percentage) and corrected according to: "In 64 clips n (%)"

Reaction

Thanks for this comment. We corrected Table 2 based on your comment.

Comment 18.

The statistical analysis method used for the P-value should be listed below the Table 1

Reaction

Thanks for this comment. We add the correlation level which is significant at the 5% level below Table 1.

Comment 19.

Choose Figure 2 with the best contrast.

Reaction

Thanks for this comment. We provided Figure 2 with a higher resolution now.

Comment 20.

What do you mean by "18.34% and 37%" in this sentence: "In the first stage, the average error rate of novice drivers was 35.41 ± 18. 18.34%, while the average error rate of experienced drivers was 16.39 ± 10.37%"

Reaction

Thanks for this comment. In the manuscript, we wanted to tell that in the first step, the average error rate (miss rate) in novice drivers was 35.41%; while, the average miss rate of experienced drivers was 16.39%. As we noticed that the error rate is confusing, we changed the error rate to the miss rate which is more common in papers.

Comment 21.

In the Results section of the text, you should avoid repeating the mean values of the variables whose data are listed in the supporting tables. Just state that the differences were "significant." It is necessary to summarize the results section.

Reaction

Thanks for this comment. We did it as follows:

"In the second stage (after the screening of the first stage clips), the average error rate of experienced drivers for 35 videos decreased significantly. The reaction time of novice drivers was 3.10 ± 1.45 and for experienced drivers was 1.52 ± 0.8."

and

"*To conclude, assessing thirty-five videos, experienced drivers had fewer miss rates, faster reaction time, and more active voxels than novice drivers in risk perception task."*

We also omitted (the mean and standard deviation) in t two highlighted places.

*"The visual attention of each participant with two variables of reaction time and the total number of correct answers of the Stroop test is shown in Table 1. In the first stage, novice drivers had less reaction time and the correct response rate was almost equa*l."

Comment 22

In the Discussion section:

More recent published papers (recent 2-3 years) should be cited.
- In the Conclusion section, you said "The present study was carried out to design a driving HPT based on fMRI", The data overall are not sufficient to support the conclusion. Aside from the issue of validity, if used in applied settings where decisions (e.g., driver's license) are based on test performance, the authors should report the internal consistency acceptable level as indices of reliability in the obtained score of HPT.

Reaction

Thanks for this comment. We cited some more recently published papers.

The results of Table 1 and Table 3 provide the data for designing the HPT. As we mentioned in the comments of the methodology section, the validity criterion for cognitive tests is the difference between novice and experienced drivers by considering interfering factors instead of internal consistency. We can add several references for confirmation.

Comment 23

- Moreover, I suggest the authors should assess the relationship between risk perception scores and accident risk. The authors need to make the strongest case they can with the data available and make clear what are the limitations of the study. I think there are major limitations to this study that should be included in the Discussion.

Reaction

Thanks for this suggestion. The primary step for studying hazard perception is having a valid tool. This study was in line with this purpose by designing a tool that compares performance differences between novice and experienced drivers. We also mentioned in a discussion that further studies could be conducted to assess the relationship between accident risks and scores from HPT.

Reactions to the comments of Reviewer#2:

Comment 1

Explain the reason for choosing this number of samples in two steps

Reaction

Thanks for this comment. This comment is similar to the first reviewer's comment that we replied to before as follows:

*"G*Power software (version 3,1) was used to calculate the sample size. Based on the purpose of this study, the difference between two independent means (two groups) tests was selected among the statistical tests. The input parameters included the effect size d = 0.8; α err. Prob. = 0.05; power (1-β err. Prob.) = 0.95, and allocation ratio N2/N1 = 1 in the software. Consequently, the*

sample size of each group was obtained as 42 samples. Consequently, the calculated sample size for each group was 42. By considering the sample drop, the sample size for each group of novice and experienced drivers was 50 participants."

Comment 2

How have the authors evaluated the normality of the data

Reaction

Thanks for this comment. we did it by *The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test*, so we revised the statistical analysis as follows:

"SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) software version 22 was applied for analyzing the data. Descriptive statistics such as mean, standard deviation, and frequency distribution were applied to describe the demographic characteristics of two groups of novice and experienced drivers. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to determine the normality of the data. Since the data were normal (p>0.05), then parametric tests were used to analyze the data. The Independent-Samples T-Test for P-value < 0.05 was utilized to analyze the differences between the two groups in variables including age, education, visual acuity and sensitivity, visual attention, weekly driving distance, miss rate, and reaction time. Besides, the miss rate of two groups in various traffic conflicts was examined by the Independent-Samples T-Test for P-value < 0.05."

Comment 3

The title of all tables should be revised a completed based on the title of the study

Reaction

Thanks for this comment. We changed the title of the Tables based on your comment.

Comment 4

The discussion should be written based on the main and applied results of the study

Reaction

Thanks for this comment. We revised the discussion as follows:

The current study developed a valid HPT, considering local, psychological, behavioral, and neuropsychological features. The test then became software, a computer program for the Windows operating system (Fig. 1). Among many skills required in safe driving, a proper and timely perception of the hazards is essential; therefore, various studies in the field of risk perception have been done in recent years such as designing new tools, training, and evaluation of these tools (Ref).

According to hazard perception studies in different countries, on one hand, HPT has been considered a predictor and differentiator between novice and experienced drivers. On the other hand, researchers have used the significant differences between novice and experienced drivers for validation of HPT (20-24). Therefore, in most studies, the validation criterion of HPT was differences between novice and experienced drivers (). The theoretical foundation of these studies is the theory of information processing defects in dangerous situations. This theory states that traffic accidents occur when individuals are unable to prevent a collision. The reason for

this inability is that a safe decision is not made at the right time to avoid the accident. The inappropriate decision has two reasons; either the risk is not detected or the diagnosis or response to the risk has been done with delay.

Assuming that people react the same way in a dangerous situation, whether behind a computer or a steering wheel, a test can be developed to predict and manipulate the risk of accidents. The traffic accidents data in our country have also shown a higher risk of accidents for novice drivers than experienced drivers; 40% of road accidents occur for novice drivers who have been licensed for less than a year (6).

In other studies, HPTs were applied to predict traffic accidents considering that there is a relationship between scores of HPT and traffic accidents. Spicer is an example who did a retrospective study to find a relationship between traffic accidents and the HTP test (29). This theory was investigated by hazard perception tests implemented by Darby, Horswill, Boufous, Cheng, and Ventsislavova (32-34). Besides, Congdon, Wells, and Horswill did prospective studies to find a relationship between traffic accidents and risk perception skills. The results of their studies confirm a significant difference between scores of novice and experienced drivers in the HPT with serious traffic accidents, leading to injuries as well as active accidents, occurring where a driver is driving a car, not a parked car.

There are various types of tests for driving licenses. The traditional one includes a paper-based test for theoretical concepts and a real road-driving test to determine practical skills. Currently, driving HPTs such as video clips, pictures, animations, and simulations are used in some developed countries as part of the driving certification and renewal process (REF). However, in developing countries such as Iran, studies on hazard perception effects on driving accidents are seldom, probably due to the lack of a valid perception test to be used in the certification process. Therefore, it is not possible to examine the relationship between accident risks and risk perception scores. The current study can fill this gap by providing this information for the prediction and correction actions of traffic risks in Iran. Further studies can be conducted for the evaluation of any relationship between accident risks and HTP scores.

We are grateful for all of these insightful comments.

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.

Maryam Hormozi: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 21 Mar 2022

The manuscript ID 121471 is entitled: Designing a Driver's Hazard Perception Test Based on the Neural Brain Images Analysis (fMRI)The comments of the reviewer are included at the bottom of this letter.

The reviewer is recommended acceptable and publication in health scope journal.

Mohammad Khammarnia: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 6 Apr 2022

Dear Editor,
The manuscript ID "121471" has been revised based on the reviewer's comments. It could be published in the journal.
Best,

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

Dear Author
Your article has been accepted for publication. We would be pleased to receive future contributions from you and your colleagues.

Best regards