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-130983
Published in: Health Scope: 11(4); e130983

Peer Review Report for "Working in Emergency Conditions and COVID-19 Pandemic in Hospitals and Health Workforce Retentions"

Author(s): Hamideh Nafar, Salime Goharinezhad, Naser Derakhshani, Emir Tahmazi Aghdam

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 20 Aug 2022
Revised Date: 24 Oct 2022
Accepted Date: 1 Nov 2022

Revision (0)

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

hasan jafary: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 5 Sep 2022

If available or possible, provide statistics on the status of this phenomenon in the country.

Mohammad Khammarnia: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 23 Sep 2022

Dear Authors,
• Revise the manuscript based on the journal guidelines. Remove abstract section
• Paragraph 3. discusses the critical conditions of the Covid-19 pandemic and the pressures on the hospital staff.
• The authors have not discussed a willingness to work under emergency conditions in the letter. It only described working in critical conditions of hospitals and its consequences. Therefore, the title of the manuscript needs to be corrected. The word "hospital " should also be mentioned in the title.
Best,

Mohammad Khammarnia: Associate Editor | Revision (0) — 23 Sep 2022

Dear Editor,
The letter manuscript entitled "Factors associated with willingness to work under emergency conditions" need Minor revision
Best,

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (0) 27 Sep 2022

Dear Author
Thanks for submitting your valuable manuscript to the journal. As a result of this, we would like to inform you that the review of your manuscript is finished, and based on the editorial decision, you need to do a "Minor Revision" on your manuscript. Even though this manuscript has enough quality to enter the review process, it needs some significant (minor) revisions in some points of view.
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.

Reviewer 1:

•,Revise the manuscript based on the journal guidelines. Remove abstract section

We appreciate your comment very much. As you commented the abstract is removed

• Paragraph 3. discuss about the critical conditions of the Covid-19 pandemic and the pressures on the hospital staff.

The reviewer has made an excellent comment. As commented, we have added this point in p3,

The COVID-19 epidemic has put a tremendous amount of strain on the healthcare field, resulting in a lack of workers as well as an increase in burnout, fatigue, and trauma among healthcare professionals. These pandemic-related hardships have occurred in a setting of significant predetermined workforce shortages and unequal distribution, in addition to a workforce where burnout, stress, and mental health issues, including a persistent risk of post-traumatic stress disorder, were already significant issues.

• The authors have not discussed about willingness to work under emergency conditions in the letter. It was only described about working in critical conditions of hospitals and its consequences. Therefore, the title of the manuscript needs to be corrected. The word "hospital " should also be mentioned in the title.

The title was checked again to rewrite: Recommendations to strengthen healthcare workers' willingness to work in hospitals during pandemics and emergencies.

Reviewer 2:
If available or possible, provide statistics on the status of this phenomenon in the country.

As you commented, we checked again but, there is no solid data that has been published by the Health Ministry of Iran.

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) 8 Oct 2022

Dear Authors,

• In this study, only the situation of employees in critical situations has been discussed, so the title of the study should be consistent with the content. My suggestion: working in critical conditions and the Covid-19 pandemic in hospitals and its consequences.

• Several studies on Corona and crises have been published in the health outlook magazine. Some of them should be mentioned and cited in the manuscript.

Mohammad Khammarnia: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 17 Oct 2022

Dear Editor,

The Manuscript needs Minor revision.

Best,

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (1) 17 Oct 2022

Dear Authors,

• In this study, only the situation of employees in critical situations has been discussed, so the title of the study should be consistent with the content. My suggestion: working in critical conditions and Covid-19 pandemic in hospitals and its consequences.

• Several studies on Corona and crises have been published in the health outlook magazine. Some of them should be mentioned and cited in the manuscript.

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.

1. Several studies on Corona and crises have been published in the health outlook magazine. Some of them should be mentioned and cited in the manuscript.

Concerning the reviewer's point of view, as commented, we have added this point in p4 based on our concept and the nature of the message that the article wants to deliver.

- The administrative, clinical, and instructional duties that are required of health professionals must be balanced with other responsibilities. The lack of a vaccination to control this new virus, scant prior experience, and evidence-based may have also stoked fear.

2. In this study, only the situation of employees in critical situations has been discussed, so the title of the study should be consistent with the content. My suggestion: working in critical conditions and the Covid-19 pandemic in hospitals and its consequences.

The title was checked again and rewritten: working in emergency conditions and the Covid-19 pandemic in hospitals and health workforce retention.

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.

Mohammad Khammarnia: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 31 Oct 2022

Dear Authors,
The corrections of the manuscript have been well done. The manuscript could be published in the journal.
Best,

Mohammad Khammarnia: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 31 Oct 2022

Dear Editor,
My decision is acceptance. The manuscript could be published in the journal.
Best,

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (2) 1 Nov 2022

Dear Editor,
My decision is acceptance. The manuscript could be published in the journal.
Best,