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://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Health Scope
Article DOI: 10.5812/jhealthscope.88314
Published in: Health Scope: 9(1); e88314

Peer Review Report for "Child Health Policies from the Lens of Equality in Iran: A Qualitative Study"

Author(s): Narges Rouhi, Hasan Jafari, Fatemeh Setoodehzadeh, Mostafa Amini-Rarani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 26 Dec 2018
Revised Date: 25 May 2019
Accepted Date: 11 Jul 2019

Revision (0)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 23 Feb 2019

1-Please use the full form of SWOT for the first time
2-The authors should explain data saturation in the sampling section
3-Regarding ethical consideration it is unclear if this study has been approved by the ethical committee or not
4- It is recommended to revise the discussion based on the exact response of the participants

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 5 Mar 2019

Dear Authors,
After reviewing the manuscript, I found that the concept, writing, and structure of the manuscript are well. However, for quality improvement, I suggest the following recommends:
- Use of the following papers:
Estimation of Child Mortality Rate in Sistan and Baluchistan Province, Eastern Iran, From 1962 to 2015
- Indicate inclusion and exclusion criteria
- Please indicate participants' Sex, Age, and other demographical variables.
- Replace reference no. 1,2,5, 10, 13, 16, 24, 32, 37, by new references

Best,

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 16 Mar 2019

Dear editor
A study on child health is helpful for policy implications. The following comments should be considered before the publication of the study.

The title is rather misleading: it mentions equalities. However, the focus of the paper is on the situational analysis of Child health programs. I think the title should be changed. An alternative title would be “assessing the situation of Child health programs using SWOT analysis”

The abstract doesn’t do justice to what the paper is about. The author has written more than 300 words in the abstract. I think it should be shorter.

The Introduction contains too many general statements that are already widely known .it is not clear what problem the author is addressing or trying to solve and why they chose their particular methodology. The author has not related the background information to the objective of the paper.

I recommend that the authors should report very clearly why and how these findings may be of interest for future research and applications. I think the last part of the conclusion:
” Moreover, addressing and strengthening opportunities as policy entry points and changing threats to opportunities could be regarded in order to the further narrowing of the inequality in child health outcomes” is a general statement. The focus of the conclusion is on socioeconomic inequalities but this study is not a socioeconomic-related study. The conclusion needs to be modified.
In general, I did not find the lens of equalities in this study and I think the perspective of this study is not socioeconomic inequality. So the title needs to be modified.

Best regards,

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 21 Mar 2019

Dear editor-in-chief,
The manuscript needs revision as follows:

Reviewer No. 1
1. Please use the full form of SWOT for the first time
2. The authors should explain data saturation in the sampling section
3. Regarding ethical consideration it is unclear if this study has been approved by the ethical committee or not
4. It is recommended to revise the discussion based on the exact response of the participants

Reviewer No. 2

1. The title is rather misleading: it mentions equalities. However, the focus of the paper is on the situational analysis of Child health programs. I think the title should be changed. An alternative title would be “assessing the situation of Child health programs using SWOT analysis”.
2. The abstract doesn’t do justice to what the paper is about. The author has written more than 300 words in the abstract. I think it should be shorter.
3. The Introduction contains too many general statements that are already widely known .it is not clear what problem the author is addressing or trying to solve and why they chose their particular methodology. The author has not related the background information to the objective of the paper.
4. I recommend that the authors should report very clearly why and how these findings may be of interest for future research and applications. I think the last part of the conclusion: ”Moreover, addressing and strengthening opportunities as policy entry points and changing threats to opportunities could be regarded in order to the further narrowing of the inequality in child health outcomes” is a general statement. The focus of the conclusion is on socioeconomic inequalities but this study is not a socioeconomic-related study. The conclusion needs to be modified.
5. In general, I did not find the lens of equalities in this study and I think the perspective of this study is not socioeconomic inequality. So the title needs to be modified.

Reviewer No. 3

Dear Authors,

After reviewing the manuscript, I found that the concept, writing, and structure of the manuscript are well. However, for quality improvement, I suggest the following recommends:

1. Use of the following papers:

Estimation of Child Mortality Rate in Sistan and Baluchistan Province, Eastern Iran, From 1962 to 2015

2. Indicate inclusion and exclusion criteria
3. Please indicate participants' Sex, Age, and other demographic variables.
4. Replace reference no. 1,2,5, 10, 13, 16, 24, 32, 37, by new references

Best regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (**0**) 30 Mar 2019

Dear

The manuscript needs revision as follows:

Reviewer No. 1

1. Please use the full form of SWOT for the first time
2. The authors should explain data saturation in the sampling section
3. Regarding ethical consideration it is unclear if this study has been approved by the ethical committee or not
4. It is recommended to revise the discussion based on the exact response of the

participants

Reviewer No. 2

1. The title is rather misleading: it mentions equalities. However, the focus of the paper is on the situational analysis of Child health programs. I think the title should be changed. An alternative title would be “assessing the situation of Child health programs using SWOT analysis”.
2. The abstract doesn’t do justice to what the paper is about. The author has written more than 300 words in the abstract. I think it should be shorter.
3. The Introduction contains too many general statements that are already widely known .it is not clear what problem the author is addressing or trying to solve and why they chose their particular methodology. The author has not related the background information to the objective of the paper.
4. I recommend that the authors should report very clearly why and how these findings may be of interest for future research and applications. I think the last part of the conclusion: ”Moreover, addressing and strengthening opportunities as policy entry points and changing threats to opportunities could be regarded in order to the further narrowing of the inequality in child health outcomes” is a general statement. The focus of the conclusion is on socioeconomic inequalities but this study is not a socioeconomic-related study. The conclusion needs to be modified.
5. In general, I did not find the lens of equalities in this study and I think the perspective of this study is not socioeconomic inequality. So the title needs to be modified.

Reviewer No. 3

Dear Authors,

After reviewing the manuscript, I found that the concept, writing, and structure of the manuscript are well. However, for quality improvement, I suggest the following recommends:

1. Use of the following papers:

Estimation of Child Mortality Rate in Sistan and Baluchistan Province, Eastern Iran, From 1962 to 2015

2. Indicate inclusion and exclusion criteria
3. Please indicate participants' Sex, Age, and other demographic variables.
4. Replace reference no. 1,2,5, 10, 13, 16, 24, 32, 37, by new references

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.

Dear Health Scope Editor,

We appreciate the *Health Scope* provides an opportunity for us to demonstrate our research. We would also like to thank the reviewer for providing useful comments to improve the quality of this article. The modified parts were highlighted in yellow color in the manuscript. Our responses to reviewer are given as follows:

Responses to Reviewer

Reviewer 1:

Dear editor

Study on child health is helpful for policy implication. The following comments should be considered before publication of the study.

1- The title is rather misleading: it mentions equalities. However, the focus of the paper is on the situational analysis of Child health programs. I think the title should be changed. An alternative title would be “assessing the situation of Child health programs using SWOT analysis”

Response: thanks reviewer for highlighting this. Respectfully, we did not aim to situation analysis. As you know, situation analysis is a unique approach and has had own methodology. Besides, “assessing” commonly is a verb using for quantitative researches not for qualitative ones. In this study we asked interviewees about equality aspects of child health program in Iran. In the previous version, we used SWOT framework for data analysis. In qualitative studies this model of analysis stands in the “directed content analysis” method. As basically and initially we conducted a qualitative study, at this revision for being specific and for shrinking misleading, we again analyzed our qualitative data based on thematic analysis method.

2- The abstract doesn't do justice to what the paper is about. The author has written more than 300 words in the abstract. I think it should be shorter.

Response: thanks reviewer for useful comment. The abstract had been revised.

3- The Introduction contains too many general statements that are already widely known .it is not clear what problem the author is addressing or trying to solve and why they chose their particular methodology. The author has not related the background information to the objective of the paper.

Response: thanks reviewer for this valuable comment. Introduction was revised.

4- I recommend that the authors should report very clearly why and how these findings may be of interest for future research and applications. I think the last part of the conclusion:

" Moreover, addressing and strengthening opportunities as policy entry points and changing threats to opportunities could be regarded in order to the further narrowing of the inequality in child health outcomes" is a general statement. The focus of conclusion is on socioeconomic inequalities but this study is not a socioeconomic-related study. The conclusion needs to be modified.

Response: It is done.

5- In general, I did not find the lens of equalities in this study and I think the perspective of this study is not socioeconomic inequality. So the title needs to be modified.

Response: Thanks reviewer for highlighting this. As we explained in the first comment, with doing the new analysis, we think, your concerns may be solved. Moreover, extracted subthemes such as rational distribution, addressing rural and

underserved regions and universal coverage, education. SDH and regional planning have had implications of inequality. Because these factors vastly recognized as equity stratifiers.

Reviewer 2:

1-Please use full form of SWOT for the first time

Response: Thanks reviewer for highlighting this. It is revised.

2-The authors should explain about data saturation in sampling section

Response: Thanks reviewer for highlighting this. Data saturation was explained in the sampling section.

3-Regarding ethical consideration it is unclear if this study has approved in ethical committee or not

Response: This study not approved in ethical committee but ethical considerations based on Helsinki Ethical Principles were regarded.

4- It is recommended to revise the discussion based on the exact response of the participants

Response: Thanks reviewer for the valuable comment. Discussion section re-writed, overall.

Reviewer 3:

Dear Authors,

After reviewing the manuscript, I found that concept, writing and structure of the manuscript is well. However, for quality improvement, I suggest the following recommends:

- Use of the following papers:

Estimation of Child Mortality Rate in Sistan and Baluchistan Province, Eastern Iran, From 1962 to 2015

Response: Thanks reviewer for highlighting this. Humbly, we read abovementioned article but this article is about a quantitative study aimed to estimate child mortality rate and we think is not related to our work.

- Indicate inclusion and exclusion criteria
Response: criteria for inclusion and exclusion were added to the paper.

- Please indicate participants' Sex, Age and other demographical variables.
Response: Thanks reviewer for highlighting this. As you suggested, information about sex was added to table 1. It is worthwhile to mention that indication of more participant characteristics may lead to no anonymity of participant.

- Replace reference no. 1,2,5, 10, 13, 16, 24, 32, 37, by new references
Response: Thanks reviewer for the comment. References number 2, 5 and 10 are the original and high citation articles in the health equality field and regardless of their publication date still cite in a high impact and Q1 journals. However, as you suggested reference number 1, 13, 16, 24, 32 and 37 were replaced.

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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 18 May 2019

Dear editor-in-chief,
The manuscript needs minor revision as follows:
1. The aim of the study should be added to the Abstract of the paper.
2. There is a large overlap in the two subthemes of the Implementation theme, Rational distribution and Universal coverage, so you can say that both refer to one subtheme. Is there a justification for separating these two?
3. What is SES mean in the last paragraph of the “Health information system and faults in data registration” section?
4. Suggestions for further studies based on the findings of the study should be added to the paper.

Best regards,

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 18 May 2019

Dear editor-in-chief,
The manuscript needs minor revision as follows:
1. The aim of the study should be added to the Abstract of the paper.
2. There is a large overlap in the two subthemes of the Implementation theme, Rational distribution and Universal coverage, so you can say that both refer to one subtheme. Is there a justification for separating these two?
3. What is SES mean in the last paragraph of the “Health information system and faults in data registration” section?
4. Suggestions for further studies based on the findings of the study should be added to the paper.

Best regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 24 May 2019

Dear author
The manuscript needs minor revision as follows:
1. The aim of the study should be added to the Abstract of the paper.
2. There is a large overlap in the two subthemes of the Implementation theme, Rational

distribution and Universal coverage, so you can say that both refer to one subtheme. Is there a justification for separating these two?

3. What is SES mean in the last paragraph of the “Health information system and faults in data registration” section?

4. Suggestions for further studies based on the findings of the study should be added to the paper.

Best regards,

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.

Dear Health Scope Editor,

We appreciate the *Health Scope* provides the second opportunity for us to demonstrate our research. We would also like to thank the reviewer for providing useful comments to improve the quality of this article. The modified parts were highlighted in yellow color in the manuscript. Our responses to reviewer are given as follows:

Responses to Reviewer

Reviewer 1:

1. The aim of the study should be added to Abstract of the paper.
   Response: thanks reviewer for highlighting this. Objective was added to the abstract.

2. There is a large overlap in the two subthemes of the Implementation theme, Rational distribution and Universal coverage, so you can say that both refer to one subtheme. Is there a justification for separating these two?
   Response: thanks reviewer for useful comment. Based on interviewees' statements, logically or rationally we should distribute the child healthcare according to PHC when we want to address child health equality. Namely, child health polices in Iran were equitable in implementation because they rationally were distributed based on PHC principles. About universal coverage, you right. As universal coverage is a concept with three pillars including access, quality and financial it is better that changed. For this, universal coverage replaced by full access for more accuracy and distinguishes.

3. What is SES mean in the last paragraph of "Health information system and faults in data registration" section?

Response: thanks reviewer for their accuracy. SES was elaborated to socio-economic status.

4. Suggestions for further studies based on the findings of the study should be added to the paper.

Recommendation for further studies was added to the end of conclusion: Based on the findings of the study, it is recommended that in the future research, child health policy analysis is done considering analysis of policy and analysis for policy approaches.

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.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 5 Jul 2019

Dear editor-in-chief,
Since the requested revisions were made, the manuscript is accepted for publication.

Best regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 11 Jul 2019

Dear author
Since the requested revisions were made, the manuscript is accepted for publication.

Best regards,