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.87022
Published in: Health Scope: 8(4) ; e87022

Peer Review Report for "Prevalence of Physical Disability in Iran: Do Existing Health Services Meet the Needs of Older People? A Letter to Editor"

Author(s): Behzad Karami-Matin, Shahin Soltani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	3 Dec 2018
Revised Date:	10 Feb 2019
Accepted Date:	2 May 2019

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 — 7 Jan 2019

Dear Author:
1- The method of assessment of "physical disability" for data in 2011 should be explained completely.
2-It is recommended to present the data according to gender.
3-It should be mentioned to available services regarding PWD in Iran and then concluded whether these services are sufficient or not.

Hossein Ansari : Associate Editor — 20 Jan 2019

Dear Editor:
This manuscript is appropriate for publication in this journal.

Ramazan Mirzaei : EIC

22 Jan 2019

Dear Author:
1- The method of assessment of "physical disability" for data in 2011 should be explained completely
2-It is recommended to present the data according to gender
3-It should be mentioned to available services regarding PWD in Iran, and then conclude whether these services are sufficient or not.

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.

We would like to thank you and the reviewer (s) for reading our manuscript and providing us with thoughtful comments and constructive suggestions, which helped us improve the quality of our work. Below, please kindly find our answers to the inquiries in the file submitted as the revised manuscript.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Hossein Ansari : Associate Editor — 28 Apr 2019

Dear Editor:
This manuscript (letter to the editor) is acceptable for publication.

Ramazan Mirzaei : EIC — 2 May 2019

Dear author:
This manuscript (letter to the editor) is acceptable for publication.
Best