Health Scope
Volume 12 · Issue 4 · e135540

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Households' Willingness to Pay for Receiving Preventive and Therapeutic Dental Services: The Double- Bounded Dichotomous Choice Approach

Fatemeh Sadeghivand, Rahim Khodayari Zarnaq, Shirin Nosratnejad

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
18 Feb 2023	10 Jul 2023	22 Jul 2023	10.5812/healthscope-135540

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 10
3 **Revision 2** Referee 1, Editor-in-Chief 11
Authors' reply to reviewers 12
Reviewer and editor comments 14

1 Original submission

2 comments · 28 Apr 2023 – 3 May 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 28 Apr 2023

Dear Editor,
 Given the importance of dental services and the high costs of these services in the public and private sectors, this study is highly necessary.
 The title should be edited to: Households´ willingness to pay to receive preventive and treatment dental services: double bounded dichotomous choice approach.
 The manuscript should be edited by a native English-speaking expert. Obtaining an editing certificate is also necessary.
 Many parts of the manuscript cannot be understood due to poor writing. Therefore, it must be rewritten and reviewed again.
 Abstract; Method section: Merge short sentences together.
 Abstract: Describe the research community, sampling method, and tools.
 Considering that the data were for the year 2019, it is suggested that data for 2023 be collected and analyzed again.
 Abstract: Discussion section: Don't repeat the results of the study. Write the conclusions and suggestions of the study.
 Discussion. Line 117: Ambiguous sentences. The text of the article must be revised, and writing errors must be corrected.
 Redesign the tables.

Best,

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 3 May 2023

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 make a "Major Revision" to your manuscript. Even though this manuscript is of sufficient quality to enter the review process, it needs some significant (major) revisions in some respects.
Best Regards

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

To: Editor-in-Chief of Health Scope

Dear Professor Ramazan Mirzaei

We would like to thank you and the reviewers for the helpful feedback that enabled us to significantly improve our manuscript entitled **"Households willingness to pay for receiving preventive and treatment dental services: double bounded dichotomous choice approach.".**

According to the major needed revision, we would like to refer to the rebuttal letter below. In order to indicate the revisions made, we highlighted the changes in the revised version of our manuscript.

Thank you again for your valuable and well-appreciated comments. Please let us know if we can be of further help.

Reviewer	Comment number	Comments	Authors 'Reply	Changes done (page and line numbers)
Reviewer 1	1	The manuscript has typographical errors. It should be edited by an English-speaking person.	Thanks for your comment. The manuscript edited by native.	
Reviewer 1	2	Abstract .More details should be included in the method, including the year of the study, place of the study, analysis methods, analysis tools, etc.	Thanks for your key comments. The details .included in abstract	Abstract, method section – page 1
Reviewer 1	3	.Once the abbreviation WTP is used for willingness to pay, it is not necessary to give the whole phrase and the abbreviation can be used.	All of "Willingness to pay" phrase changed to .abbreviation WTP	Abstract – page 1
Reviewer 1	4	In Conclusion, the interpretation of the results should be written, not repeating the results.	.We revised the conclusion and edited	Abstract, Conclusion section – page 1
Reviewer 1	5	Your Select keywords through MeSH.	Thanks for your key comment, we changed the .keywords through MeSH	keywords section – page 1
Reviewer 1	6	Background: When an acronym is mentioned in the paper, the acronym must be preceded by the full phrase for the	Thanks for your comment. We revised and edited.	Background section – page 2

		first time. This is not considered for WTP in Line 2 of paragraph 3.		
Reviewer 1	7	Methods: How was the sample size calculated?	Thanks for the valuable comment, the section of sample size and data collection added to manuscript	Method, Sample size section – paragraph1– page2
Reviewer 1	8	The inclusion and exclusion criteria for the study should be mentioned.	Thanks for the valuable comment, the section Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria added to manuscript	Method, inclusion and exclusion criteria section – paragraph1 – page3
Reviewer 1	9	It is better to move the ethical considerations ("The study was also approved by the ethics committee …") to the end of the method.	We added the section of ethical approval in manuscript	Method, ethical approval section– page4
Reviewer 1	10	How the questionnaire questions chosen and how many questions were were included? What dental services? Give more explanation.	Thanks for clarification, we added the detail of questionnaire	Method, Questionnaire section– page3
Reviewer 1	11	Explain more clearly the validity and reliability of the questionnaire. In this case, references 10 and 11 are irrelevant.	Thanks for the valuable comment, We revised and .explained in more detail	Method, Questionnaire section– page3
Reviewer 1	12	The phrase "To avoid starting point bias …" is unclear and no reference is given.	Starting bid bias is one of the common bias in Double bonded dichotomous choice method. Starting-point bias means that the respondents are influenced by the amount used to start the bidding and may think that it represents the value of the good or service in question.	Method, Questionnaire section- paragraph2 -page3
Reviewer 1	13	The equations should be numbered and the components of the formulas should be determined.	We revised it	Method, - analysis section– pages4
Reviewer 1	14	Results What was the exchange rate between Iranian Rials and US dollars?	The exchange rate between Iranian Rials and US Dollar added in table 2	Figures and Tables section– Table2- pages8
Reviewer 1	15	We should not start a sentence with a number in a scientific paper. This is not considered in paragraph 1.	We revised the sentence.	Results section– pages5
Reviewer	16	What does "Bruce" mean in paragraph 3?	Thanks for your attention,	

1			Sometimes tooth Scaling is also called Bruce.	
Reviewer 1	17	Discussion: It is suggested to rewrite the Discussion section better and more scientifically.	The discussion revised again and edited by an English-speaking person.	Discussion section–-pages5
Reviewer 1	18	One inherent limitation of WTP studies is that revealed preferences may differ from decisions people make in the real world. Also, the tendency to final payment estimated in these studies is usually overestimated; Because people usually pay less attention to their budget constraints in making decisions in such situations. Please discuss these matters.	Thank you for your valuable comment, the suggested items were discussed in the discussion section.	Discussion section– Last paragraph-pages7
Reviewer 1	19	Table 1: the total number should also be given. The phrase "Did not go to school" should be corrected. What is meant by regular dentists' visits? Is the income monthly?	" Did not go to school " phrase changed to "Illiterate". The income is monthly and was edited to "monthly income". A regular visit in this study means an examination by a dentist at least once a year.	Figures and Tables section– Table1-pages8
Reviewer 1	20	Table 2: it is not explained in the main text. The reference group for the statistical test has not been determined.	Thank you for your valuable comment. Table 2 is related to the estimated average willingness to pay for services, and in table one, the grouping of variables was mentioned.	Figures and Tables section– Table1-pages8
Reviewer 1	21	Conclusion: Overall, the Conclusion needs to be further strengthened. It is suggested to rewrite the Conclusion section better.	The Conclusion revised again and edited by an English-speaking person.	Conclusion section – page 7
Reviewer 2	1	The data belong to about 5 years ago. What is the justification?	Thanks for the clarification comment, the Data of study belongs to fall 2019 (nearly 3.5 years ago). Also The results of willingness-to-pay studies are a threshold for evaluating different interventions in cost-benefit studies. Therefore, the results of all	

			WTP studies in the past can be converted into current time amounts with the PPP (Purchasing Power Parity) index, and policymakers use these amounts to make decisions in Evaluation of different interventions with different outcomes in different times.	
Reviewer 2	2	The authors should explain about sample size determination	Thanks for the valuable comment, the section of sample size and data collection added to manuscript	Method, Sample size and Sample selection section – paragraph1,3 – page2
Reviewer 2	3	Please explain about random sampling in detail	.We revised and we explained in more detail	Method, Sample selection section – paragraph2, - page2
Reviewer 2	4	Please mention to SD along with the Means and frequencies along with all percentages	We added SD along with the Means to table2.	Figures and Tables section– Table2- pages8
Reviewer 2	5	In table 2 please specified that you mean monthly income	.We revised and edited	Figures and Tables section– Table2- pages8
Reviewer 2	6	In Table 3, clearly specify that what the dependent variable is and what regression model is used. If the dependent variables are dichotomous, the authors should explain about this	Thank you for the clarification. It is helpful to know that internal regression is used in WTP studies to estimate effective variables on WTP amounts, and that in the double bounded dichotomous choice approach, the dependent variable can have four conditions. It is also useful to see the addition of the kind of regression in Table 2 and the grouping of independent variables in Table 1.	Figures and Tables section– Table2- pages8
Reviewer	7	In Table 3, clearly define what the asterisk sign	Thank you for your attention and valuable	Figures and Tables

2		means	comment; we revised the table 3 and added the definition of star sign in footnote of table	section– Table3-pages9
Reviewer 3	1	Title should be edited as: Households willingness to pay for receiving preventive and treatment dental services: double bounded dichotomous choice approach.	We changed the title of article	Title–page1
Reviewer 3	2	The manuscript should be edited by a native expert. Also, receiving an edition certificate is necessary.	Thanks for your comment. The manuscript edited .by native	
Reviewer 3	3	Many parts of the manuscript cannot be understood due to poor writing. Therefore, it must be written and reviewed again.	Thanks for your comment. The Method Discussion and Conclusion sections was revised again and edited by an English-speaking person.	
Reviewer 3	4	Abstract; Method section: Merge short sentences together.	.We revised and edited	Abstract, method section – page 1
Reviewer 3	5	Abstract: describe about the research community, sampling method and tools.	Thanks for your comment. We revised the .abstract	Abstract, method section – page 1
Reviewer 3	6	Considering that the data was for the year 2019, it is suggested that the data for 2023 be collected and analyzed again.	Thank you for your valuable suggestion, fortunately, the PPP (Purchasing Power Parity) Index using to adjust WTP results to current time amount. This allows policy makers to compare the costs and benefits of different interventions in a consistent manner, regardless of changes in time, currency exchange rates or inflation rates	
Reviewer 3	7	Abstract: Discussion section: don't repeat the result of the study. Write the conclusion and suggestions for the study.	Thanks for your comment. We revised it	Abstract, Discussion section – page 1
Reviewer 3	8	Discussion. Line 117: ambiguous sentences. Revision of the text of the article and writing corrections must be done	Thanks for your comment. The entire Discussion section was revised again and edited by an English-speaking person.	
Reviewer 3	9	Redesign Tables again.	We redesign the tables .	Figures and Tables section– Table1-pages8

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 23 Jun 2023 – 25 Jun 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 23 Jun 2023

Dear Authors,
Method section: indicate the type of study.
Table 1. Redesign the table. What are the dimensions of the variables? For example, education, insurance, etc. Where are the dimensions of the variables?
The authors should cite related papers published in the journal Health Scope.
Best,

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 25 Jun 2023

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 make a "Minor Revision" to your manuscript. Even though this manuscript is of sufficient quality to enter the review process, it needs some significant (minor) revisions in some respects.
Best Regards

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

To: Editor-in-Chief of Health Scope

Dear Professor Ramazan Mirzaei

We would like to thank you and the reviewers for the helpful feedback that enabled us to significantly improve our manuscript entitled **"Households willingness to pay for receiving preventive and treatment dental services: double bounded dichotomous choice approach."**

According to the minor needed revision, we would like to refer to the rebuttal letter below. In order to indicate the revisions made, we highlighted the changes in the revised version of our manuscript.

Thank you again for your valuable and well-appreciated comments. Please let us know if we can be of further help.

Reviewer	Comment number	Comments	Authors 'Reply	Changes done (page and line numbers)
Reviewer 1	1	Method section: indicate the type of the study.	Thanks for your comment. The type of study is mentioned in the first line of the method section.	Method section/ page 2
Reviewer 1	2	Table 1. redesign the Table. What are the dimensions of the variables? For example: education, insurance and etc. where are the dimensions of the variables?	Thanks for your key comments. We revised and .edited	Figures and Table/ page 8
Reviewer 1	3	The authors should cite to related published papers in the health scope journal.	Thanks for your valuable comment. In the discussion section, reference was made to two articles published in the Health Scope journal.	Reference 15 and 23
Reviewer 2	1	The authors have revised the manuscript based on the reviewers' comments	Thanks for all your valuable comments on our manuscript.	

Reviewer 3	1	The English language of the article still needs improvement.	Thanks for your comment. The manuscript edited by an English-native person.	Total manuscript
Reviewer 3	2	Select keywords through MeSH.	Thanks for your key comment, we changed .the keywords through MeSH	keywords section – page 1
Reviewer 3	3	In such scientific manuscripts, the Methods section usually does not start with the sample size. Please correct the order of subheadings logically in the section.	Thanks for your comment. The order of the method section was revised to begin with the type of study and general cases, followed by the mention of other cases.	Method section/ page 2,3
Reviewer 3	4	Reference 11 in the phrase “Furthermore, previous studies confirmed the reliability of the questionnaire (11)” in the Methods section is irrelevant.	Thanks for your comment, the mentioned section .was removed	Method section – page 2
Reviewer 3	5	What was the rate between Iranian Rials and US dollars?	Thanks for your comment. The amounts were exchanged to dollars using the dollar rate at the time of data collection. (1$= 145000rials)	

3 Revision 2

2 comments · 20 Jul 2023 – 22 Jul 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 20 Jul 2023

Dear Authors,
My decision is acceptance. However, the authors should check Tables 2 and 3 for empty cells. Also, capitalize "Table" in the text ("table" is incorrect).
Best,

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 22 Jul 2023

Dear editor in chief
Since the necessary revisions were made, the manuscript qualifies for publication in the journal. However, the authors should check Tables 2 and 3 for empty boxes. Also, capitalize the word Table throughout the text (not table).
Best regards