OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (0)

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 the Review Comments

Journal: Health Scope

Manuscript #: Id: 44610

Title of Paper: Women with osteoporosis have needs for managing their illness: A qualitative study

Authors: Arezoo Fallahi, Sina Valiee, Sally Wai-chi Chan

Date Sent: 2017 July 1

We appreciate the time and effort of the editor and referees in reviewing this manuscript. We have addressed all issues indicated in the review report, and we hope that the revised version will meet the journal publication requirements.

Response to Comments from Reviewer 1

We humbly and gratefully appreciate the respected reviewer's comments and have addressed the issues raised:

Comment 1:

Inability to speak fluent Kurdish (local language) is not an exclusion criterion. The ability to speak is assessed before the participant selection for the study.

Response:
Thanks for the suggestion. It was modified in the paper.

Comment 2:

Which one of the content analyses did you use? Please express in abstract and method section.

Response:
Thanks for the suggestion. It was modified in the paper.

Comment 3:

Please explain the analysis method step by step according to the content analysis references.

Response:
The analysis method, step by step, according to conventional content analysis, was explained.

Comment 4:

Mixed method of data collection is not a criterion for dependability. It is used for credibility. Please revise it.

Response:

Trustworthiness of the findings was modified.

Response to Comments from Reviewer 2

We humbly and gratefully appreciate the respected reviewer's comments and have addressed the issues raised:

Comment 1:

The title was changed as follows: Women's needs with osteoporosis for managing their illness

Response:
Title was changed as follow: Women' needs with osteoporosis for managing their illness

Comment 2:

Flutent Kurdish speaking ability is one of the inclusion criteria.

Response:
Thanks for the suggestion. It was modified in the paper.

Comment 3:

Drawing will be explained further.

Response:
More information was described about drawing in part of the method.

Comments 4:

The type of content analysis should be mentioned.

Response:

The type of content analysis was mentioned.

Comment 5:

What has been done to increase the credibility, confirmability and transferability of data?

Response:
The trustworthiness of the findings was explained in part of the method.

Comment 6:

For recording interviews, people had been allowed?

Response:
The patients allowed researchers to record their sounds.

Comment 7:

Figures 1-5 are not in the manuscript.

Response:

Figures 1-5 were shown in the manuscript.

Comment 8:

Discussion needs to be changed and references added. Because qualitative research is context-based, comparing results with other studies is not customary.

Response:
Thanks for the suggestion. It was added to the paper.

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.57234
Published in: Health Scope: 8(2) ; e57234

Peer Review Report for "Needs of Women with Osteoporosis in Disease Self-Management: A Qualitative Study"

Author(s): Arezoo Fallahi, Sina Valiee, Sally Wai-Chi Chan

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	1 Jul 2017
Revised Date:	20 May 2018
Accepted Date:	13 Jul 2018

Revision (0)

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

Fariba Yaghoubinia : Reviewer — 19 Dec 2017

Dear Authors,
1- You don't have exclusion criteria. Being less than 50 years of age is not an exclusion criterion. In fact, you entered the participants who were 50 years old or older.

2- In the last line of the method, there is a Spelling mistake (Proteins instead of patients).

Hassan Okati-Aliabad : Associate Editor — 23 Dec 2017

Dear Editor-in-Chief,
The manuscript entitled "Health Women's Needs with Osteoporosis for managing their illness: A qualitative study " needs more revision. The comments are as follows;
1- You do not have exclusion criteria. Being less than 50 years of age is not an exclusion criterion. In fact, you entered the participants who were 50 years old or older
2- In the last line of the method, there is a Spelling mistake (Proteins instead of patients).

Ramazan Mirzaei : EIC

23 Dec 2017

Dear author,
The manuscript entitled "Health Women's Needs with Osteoporosis for managing their illness: A qualitative study " needs more revision. The comments are as follows;
1- You do not have exclusion criteria. Being less than 50 years of age is not an exclusion criterion. In fact, you entered the participants who were 50 years old or older
2- In the last line of the method, there is a Spelling mistake (Proteins instead of patients).

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 the Review Comments

Journal: Health Scope

Manuscript #: 57234

Title of Paper: Women with osteoporosis have needs for managing their illness: A qualitative study

Authors: Arezoo Fallahi, Sina Valiee, Sally Wai-chi Chan

Date Sent: 2017 December 23

We appreciate the time and effort of the editor and referees in reviewing this manuscript. We have addressed all issues indicated in the review report, and we hope that the revised version will meet the journal publication requirements.

Response to Comments from Reviewer 1

We humbly and gratefully appreciate the respected reviewer's comments and have addressed the issues raised:

Comment 1:

You do not have exclusion criteria. Being less than 50 years of age is not an exclusion criterion. In fact, you entered the participants who were 50 years old or older.

Response:

Thanks for the suggestion. It was modified in the paper.

Comment 2:

In the last line of the method there is a Spelling mistake (Proteins instead of patients).

Response:

Thanks for the suggestion. It was modified in the paper.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Hassan Okati-Aliabad : Reviewer — 13 May 2018

Dear Editor-in-Chief,
The manuscript entitled" Health Literacy in Iran: a systematic Review article" needs more revision. The comments are as follows;
1- Inclusion and exclusion criteria are incompatible in the abstract section with the materials and methods section. Please correct this contradiction.

Hassan Okati-Aliabad : Associate Editor — 13 May 2018

Dear Editor-in-Chief,
The manuscript entitled" Health Literacy in Iran: a systematic Review article" needs more revision. The comments are as follows;
1- Inclusion and exclusion criteria are incompatible in the abstract section with the materials and methods section. Please correct this contradiction.

Ramazan Mirzaei : EIC — 14 May 2018

The manuscript entitled" Health Literacy in Iran: a systematic Review article" needs more revision. The comments are as follows;
1- Inclusion and exclusion criteria are incompatible in the abstract section with the materials and methods section. Please correct this contradiction.

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.

Authors' Response to the Review Comments

Journal: Health Scope

Manuscript #: 57234

Title of Paper: Women with osteoporosis have needs for managing their illness: A qualitative study

Authors: Arezoo Fallahi, Sina Valiee, Sally Wai-chi Chan

Date Sent: 2018 May 20

We appreciate the time and effort of the editor and referees in reviewing this manuscript. We have addressed all issues indicated in the review report, and we hope that the revised version will meet the journal publication requirements.

Response to Comments from Reviewer

We humbly and gratefully appreciate the respected reviewer's comments and have addressed the issues raised:

Comment 1:

Inclusion and exclusion criteria are incompatible in the abstract section with the materials and methods section. Please correct this contradiction.

Response:

Thanks for the suggestion. It was modified in the paper.

Please modify the affiliation of authors as follows:

Arezoo Fallahi[1*],Sina Valiee[2], Sally Wai-chi Chan[3]

1- Assistant professor, Environmental Health Research Center, Research Institute for Health Development, Kurdistan University of Medical Sciences, Sanandaj, Iran. Corresponding author: arezofalahi91@gmail.com

2- Associate professor, Clinical Care Research Center, Kurdistan University of Medical Sciences, Sanandaj, Iran. sinavaliee@yahoo.com

3- Professor, Department of Nursing and Midwifery, Faculty of Health and Medicine, University of Newcastle, Australia. sally.chan@newcastle.edu.au

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Hassan Okati-Aliabad : Reviewer — 13 Jul 2018

Dear Associate Editor,
The manuscript entitled " Women' needs with osteoporosis for managing their illness: A qualitative study" has been modified according to the reviewer comments and is ready for the next step.
Kind Regards,

Hassan Okati-Aliabad : Associate Editor — 13 Jul 2018

Dear Editor-in-Chief,
The manuscript entitled " Women' needs with osteoporosis for managing their illness: A qualitative study" has been modified according to the reviewer comments and is ready for the next step.
Kind Regards,

Ramazan Mirzaei : EIC — 13 Jul 2018

Dear EIC,
The manuscript entitled " Women' needs with osteoporosis for managing their illness: A qualitative study" has been modified according to the reviewer comments and is ready for the next step.
Kind Regards,