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 "**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:

Peer Review

Health Scope
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/jhealthscope.57203
Published in: Health Scope: 8(2) ; e57203

Peer Review Report for "Behavioral Determinants of Self-Management Behaviors in Rheumatoid Arthritis Patients: A Qualitative Study"

Author(s): Mosharafeh Chaleshgar Kordasiabi, Behnaz Enjezab, Maassoumeh Akhlaghi, MH Baghianimoghadam, Mohammad Ali Morowatisharifabad

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	1 Jul 2017
Revised Date:	7 Mar 2018
Accepted Date:	20 Jun 2018

Revision (0)

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

Masoumeh Abbasi-Shavazi : Reviewer

6 Nov 2017

In the name of God
The Honorable Editor-in-Chief of Health Scope Magazine
With greetings and best wishes
Respectfully, while thanking you and your colleagues for their unwavering efforts, I would like to inform you that the present article was reviewed under the title "Behavioral determinants of self-management behaviors in rheumatoid arthritis patients: a qualitative directed content analysis".
In this regard, the subject of this research, which is in the field of behavioral determinants of self-management in patients with rheumatoid arthritis, can be useful for people who work in the field of health promotion of chronic patients,

including rheumatoid arthritis patients. Therefore, the present article will have its own special appeal for this group of readers. On the other hand, since this article has chosen a qualitative approach to examine the realities faced by patients in managing the complications of this disease in their real lives, it seems that it can have many functional and practical implications for researchers in this field. At the same time, to improve this article, it seems necessary to mention several corrective points, which are as follows, in the order of the sections of the article:

Abstract:

1- In the introduction of the abstract, after defining rheumatoid arthritis, the reason for choosing this topic for research is not mentioned, while in the introduction of the article, this research gap is mentioned. It is very important that the introduction of the abstract also mentions the reason for conducting the research, while respecting the word limit.

2- In the methods section of the abstract, the reason for selecting the samples using the purposeful sampling approach should be briefly explained.

3- In the conclusion section of the abstract, the final result of the study should be mentioned more functionally and practically, and in line with the purpose of the study, which can even include strategic suggestions for future studies.

Introduction:

1- Although the introduction discusses the definition of the disease and SMB, the factors affecting self-care behaviors based on studies are briefly mentioned. However, the authors should provide a more detailed and comprehensive explanation of the determinants of these behaviors based on other studies, so that the necessity of conducting this study is revealed by referring to the research gap in this field.

Materials and Methods:

1- At the beginning of the methods section, the authors mentioned the study approach and then mentioned the reasons for choosing this approach, which is a direct quote from Hsieh H-F and Shannon. This is because the reasons for choosing it in practical language by the researchers could be more constructive, while they could also cite the aforementioned authors.

2- On the other hand, was the use of the directed content analysis approach only to validate the model or theory, or did the researchers also reach other themes that were outside the scope of this structure?

4- It seems better to provide more explanation about the setting of this study, which is called the Rheumatology Clinic in the Shariati Hospital of Tehran University of Medical Sciences. It is mentioned in the methods section. Because the sampling location, if it is a referral center, can indicate the diversity of the samples.

5- Regarding open-ended interview questions, the authors have mentioned the number of questions in the model structures. This is why it is better to provide an example of a question in each structure by mentioning the name of the structure.

6- There is ambiguity in sampling. Sampling should be explained clearly according to the logic governing qualitative research. Simply stating purposeful sampling, and that according to age and gender, has created ambiguity. In addition, the sampling method explained in this section is based on the patients' scores in the SMB, which again adds to the ambiguity of sampling. Therefore, it is necessary:

A: If the authors have a mixed approach, they should point to it and refer to it, and confirm that this is part of a mixed study. Such an approach in writing the methods section not only helps to clarify the method used, but also ensures inconsistent in terms of publishing the qualitative section of the work.
B: In the abstract section, the sampling method should be standardized and summarized based on these amendments.
7- In the methods section, some information is provided about some ethical considerations used in the interview with patients, but nothing is seen about the Ethical approval of this study. It is better to bring all this information in one place and under the title of Ethical Considerations.
Results:
Since the categories and subcategories obtained in this study are well described in the results section, it seems that displaying these categories and subcategories in the form of a map or conceptual network can be effective for easier identification of the work. Discussion:
The discussion seems to be relatively well developed. However:
1- The authors have moved on from the conclusion section quickly, so the conclusion section of the study needs to be written more carefully and more practically so that it can include innovative ideas and suggestions for future research.
2- In the limitations section, it would be better to address the problems that the researcher definitely had in collecting data with these patients, as well as other problems.

Sedigheh Abedini : Reviewer

24 Dec 2017

Dear Editor of Health Scope Journal:
The comments of this paper, entitled “behavioral determinant of self–management behaviors in rheumatoid arthritis patients: a qualitative directed content analysis,” include these tips:
• Title: in title qualitative study is enough and don’t need to explain.
• Method:
1- Ethical approval code is required in the method.
2- The question in od interview guide is written on the paper.
3- More information is required about the PRECEDE model.
4- Explanation about the SMB score, validity, reliability, and measurement of this questionnaire within the method.
• Result:
1- Recommended that first write one the themes and then write the sub-themes, after that they give a brief explanation of them and then confirm the participants.
2- The demographic tables are not seen in the result. Please add this table.
• Discussion:
1- Please write et al instead of colleagues in text.
2- The number of references written at the end of sentences.
3- Preferably use more new references.(references as much as 10 years old as far as possible).

Hassan Okati-Aliabad : Associate Editor

25 Dec 2017

Dear Editor-in-Chief,
The manuscript entitled "behavioral determinant of self–management behaviors in rheumatoid arthritis patients: a qualitative directed content analysis " was reviewed by two reviewers, and the comments are as follows;
First reviewer
• Title: In a title qualitative study is enough and doesn't need to explain.
• Method:
1- Ethical approval code is required in the method.
2- The question in od interview guide is written on the paper.
3- More information is required about the PRECEDE model.
4- Explanation about the SMB score, validity, reliability, and measurement of this questionnaire within the method.
• Result:
1- Recommended that first write one the themes and then write the sub-themes, after that they give a brief explanation of them and then confirm the participants.
2- The Demographic tables are not seen in the results. Please add this table.
• Discussion:
1- Please write et al instead of colleagues in text.
2- The number of references written at the end of sentences.
3- Preferably use more new references.(references as much as 10 years old as far as possible).

Second reviewer
Abstract:
1- In the introduction, despite the definition of rheumatoid arthritis, there is no statement of the necessity of this research, while in the introduction of the article, the research gap is mentioned partly. Stating the necessity is very important, regarding the limitation of words, based on the journal's rules.
2. In the method, it is needed to briefly describe the reasons why the samples are selected using a purposeful sampling approach.
3. In conclusion, the final result of the study should be stated more practically and in line with the purpose of the study, which may even include strategic tips or guidance for future studies.
Introduction:
1- In the introduction, although the definition of the disease and the SMB have been addressed, factors affecting self-care behaviors are less emphasized. However, authors need to give more explicit explanations about determinants of these behaviors, referring to other studies, so that the research gap in this context can be more obvious.
Material and methods:
At the beginning of the methodology section, the authors referred to the study approach and then paid attention to some reasons for choosing this approach with a direct quote from Hsieh H-F and Shannon. However, citing the practical reasons for

choosing the approach of the study, along with referring to these authors, can be more constructive.

On the other hand, one question is whether using the directed content analysis is applied only to validating the model or theory, or whether the researchers reached other themes beyond the scope of the framework? Authors should explain it clearly.

Since the setting of the study can be an indicator of sample diversity, especially in the case of referral centers, it seems better to explain in more detail about the setting of the study, called "Rheumatology Clinic in the Shariati Hospital of the Tehran University of Medical Sciences".

Regarding interview open questions, the authors point to the number of questions in the model structures. However, it is better to give a sample of the question in each structure with the name of the structure.

Sampling should be clearly explained according to the logic of the qualitative research. Statement of the purposeful sampling regarding the age, sex, and ... created an ambiguity in the sampling approach. In addition, the sampling approach described in this section is based on patient scores in the SMB, which has also added to the obscurity. Therefore, it is necessary that:

It seems that the study applied the mixed method approach, and then the authors need to confirm the study as a part of a mixed method study. Such an explanation of writing methodologies not only helps to clarification of the methodology, but also does not seem to have any conflict with the publication of this study.

In this regard, concordance of the abstract section based on these amendments is necessary.

In the methods section, some ethical considerations in interviewing patients have been presented, while at the same time, there is nothing about Ethical A approval. It is better to bring all these materials in one place under the heading Ethical Considerations.

Result:

Since themes and sub-themes that emerged from the interviews are well described in the result section, it seems that representing these themes and sub-themes in the form of a conceptual network or map can complete exhibiting the results more explicitly.

Discussion:

Though the discussion is fairly written down, it seems that the conclusion section should be carefully and more practically written. In this way, it can include innovative ideas and references to future research. Additionally, in the Limitations section, it is needed that the researchers pay particular attention to the problems they have definitely encountered in data gathering with the rheumatoid arthritis patients and any other problems in the process of this qualitative study.

Ramazan Mirzaei : EIC

30 Dec 2017

The comments of this paper, entitle “behavioral determinant of self–management behaviors in rheumatoid arthrithis patients: a qualitative directed content analysis ”are include this tips:

• Title: in title qualitative study is enough and don’t need to explain.

• Method:

1- Ethical approval code is required in the method.

2- The question in od interview guide is written on the paper.

3- More information is required about the PRECEDE model.

4- Explanation about the SMB score, validity, reliability, and measurement of this questionnaire within the method.

• Result:

1- Recommended that first write one the themes and then write the sub-themes, after that they give a brief explanation of them and then confirm the participants.

2- The Demographic tables are not seen in result, please add this table.

• Discussion:

1- Please write et al instead of colleagues in text.

2- The number of references written at the end of sentences.

3- Preferably use more new references.(references as much as 10 years old as far as possible).

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.

.Authors' response to Decision on manuscript ID 57203
Behavioral determinants of self-management behaviors in rheumatoid arthritis patients: a" "qualitative directed content analysis

,Dear Editor
We are grateful for the positive and constructive comments that originated from the review process. We have responded to the points raised by the reviewers and the editorial .comments as follows
:Reviewer1
:Abstract -
.Corrected in the introduction -1
Corrected in method -2
corrected in conclusion-3

:INTRODUCTION-
.Based on the aim of paper, don't need to explain social determinant of SMB -1

:METHODS
,Corrected in text -1
.this approach in this study used for valid this model-2
.Explained in text -3
.The interview schedule as a figure show in full text (material and methods) -4
.Sampling was explained in text comprehensively -5
.Ethical approval was inserted in the text -6

:RESULT
Theme and subtheme were corrected, and the conceptual framework was inserted -1

:DISCUSSION
inserted in text -1
.Limitation was explained in the text -2

:Reviewer 2
.TITLE: qualitative study is replaced
:METHOD
.ethical approval code was inserted -1
.corrected in text -2
SMB score, validity, reliability, and the measurement of this questionnaire are explained -3 .in the text

:RESULT

.corrected -1
.demographic tables added to the result -2

:DISCUSSION
corrected -1
corrected -2

:EIC Decision
.All responses to these comments were replied to

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Masoumeh Abbasi-Shavazi : Reviewer

22 May 2018

Dear Editor of Health Scope Journal:
I am pleased to note that the reformation carried out by the authors of the present article, entitled "Behavioral determinants of self-management behaviors in rheumatoid arthritis patients: a qualitative directed content analysis," was reviewed.
In this regard, considering the word limitation of this journal, it seems that some of the most important comments are considered and necessary reformation applied, especially in sections of:
• Abstract; methods
• Introduction: the reason for applying the qualitative method and introducing the PRECED model
• Method: the reason for implementing a mixed method study, detailed information about the interview guide, and showing demographic characteristics of the participants (in a table)
Additionally, some study limitations in data gathering related to the small number of men and the inability of some participants due to problems related to arthritis in the process of this qualitative study have been brought up.
Overall, the article seems to be acceptable and printable in the Health Scope Journal.

Sedigheh Abedini : Reviewer

3 Jun 2018

Dear Editor of Health Scope Journal

I am pleased to note that the edition carried out by the authors of this article, entitled "Behavioral determinants of self-management behaviors in rheumatoid arthritis patients: a qualitative directed content analysis," was reviewed.
In this revised version, the most important comments are considered in the text.
These items include:
• Title
• Method: approval code, interview guide, PRECEDE model detail, SMB score,
• Result: theme and subtheme written in text, respectively
• Discussion: done
• References: ok
• The demographic table is bright in method.

Finally, this article is acceptable in the Health Scope Journal
With respect

Hassan Okati-Aliabad : Associate Editor

19 Jun 2018

Dear Editor-in-Chief,
The manuscript entitled "Behavioral determinants of self-management behaviors in rheumatoid arthritis patients: a qualitative study" has been modified according to the reviewer comments and is ready for the next step.
Kind regards,

Ramazan Mirzaei : EIC

20 Jun 2018

Dear EIC:
The manuscript entitled "Behavioral determinants of self-management behaviors in rheumatoid arthritis patients: a qualitative study" has been modified according to the reviewer comments and is ready for the next step.
Kind regards