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://brief.land/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Health Scope
Article DOI: 10.5812/jhealthscope.96366
Published in: Health Scope: 9(2); e96366

Peer Review Report for "Main Factors Leading to Supplier-Induced Demand in Iran: A Comprehensive Review"

Author(s): Hesam Seyedin, Mahnaz Afshari, Parvaneh Isfahani, Amir Rakhshan, Ebrahim Hasanzadeh, Masood Taherimirghaed

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 15 Jul 2019
Revised Date: 20 Jan 2020
Accepted Date: 16 Mar 2020

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) — 29 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
Comments to the Authors:
1- The article requires grammatical review and improvement in the writing style.
2- Despite the originality of this work, I am not certain of the usefulness of the results because they involve ideas which have been restated and related to different policy initiatives, for totally different conditions.
3- The conclusion is incomplete. Nothing can be concluded about listing SID- induced issues in order of priority. This conclusion is generalist for SID studies.
Thanks.

Hossein Ansari: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 5 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:

1- What is the difference of this study with "Qualitative meta-synthesis"?
2- The authors have claimed that searched in Iranmedex database.but there is no database by this name since 2016 in Iran.
3- Why have not the authors searched in Cochran database?
4- Please present the chart regarding risk of bias of the studies.
5- Table 1 wrongly has been typed as "Table 12"
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 9 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
The scope of the study is an important issue in the field of healthcare, However, I believe the paper can be significantly improved by attending following points by the authors:
Abstract
• The abstract of the article does not require a search strategy.
• The structure of the abstract should obey the journal's guideline
• In keywords: Organize keywords based on the MESH system
Method
• You wrote the paper title “qualitative systematic review”, but did not mention it in the text. By the way, in “qualitative systematic review” you should find and analysis of qualitative primary studies, not all types of studies!!
• The question of the study is not very clear and it does not show the necessity of using the systematic method for answering it?
• Describe the third step items (eligibility) of figure 1 in the precise text, especially the “Not access to Full text” and the “Duplicate”?
• How many persons participated in screening, selecting, and extracting data and quality assessment? (Mention them and their expertise). What is your strategy for disagreement between persons?
• Please mention inclusion and exclusion criteria for screening of primary studies clearly?
• Have you evaluated all types (qualitative, analytical, and descriptive-analytical) of studies based on a quality assessment tool? Add the quality assessment table as the second table of the article.
• Why the author has done this research at a local level? If this is important to you why not search all the Iranian databases (such as a magician, random, and …)?
• The study has highly severe heterogeneity. What is your strategy for this matter?
• What is your strategy for gray papers? Mention it clearly
Finding
• Correct number and title of tables (spatially table 1). Graphs and tables should be provided in accordance with the format and standards of systematic review studies.
• This classification method of the factors affecting SID that is presented in (Table 1) is not already present in previous papers and studies?
Discussion
• It is still vague what is the benefit of doing such a systematic review and what gaps has it covered?
conclusion
• Strength points and limitations of the study are not mentioned. State clearly how you

solved the limitations of the study. (In this article, only Persian and English articles were used, this is language bias. What is your solution to reduce this bias?)
• The Conclusion appears weak and needs to be further strengthened with sharp messages
• The manuscript suffers from poor English (few spelling and grammatical errors). I recommend you get it to edit it by a native English speaker to help
References:
• Some of the used references are very old and so need to be updated.
• Please correct in accordance with the guidelines of the journal
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (**0**)** 10 Nov 2019

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (**0**)** 25 Nov 2019

Dear author
This manuscript needs a major revision before it can be considered for publication.
Thanks.

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.

Reviewer	Reviewer comment(s)	Response	Locates of manuscript
(Reviewer 1)	1- The article requires grammatical review and improvement in the writing style.	Done	
	2- Despite the originality of this work, I am not certain of the usefulness of the results because they involve ideas which have been restated and related to different policy initiatives, for totally different conditions.	Done.	Context, page 4
	3- The conclusion is incomplete. Nothing can be concluded about listing SID- induced issues in order of priority. This conclusion is generalist for SID studies.	Done	Conclusion, page 12
(Reviewer 2)	1-What is the difference of this study with "Qualitative meta-synthesis"?	Method of this article is systematic review because we have examined qualitative and quantitative studies.	
	2-The authors have claimed that searched in Iranmedex database. But there is no database by this name since 2016 in Iran.	This is link it: http://www.iranmedex.com/	
	3-why have not the authors searched in Cochran database?	It was searched and added in text.	Method , Page 4
	4-please present the chart regarding risk of bias of the studies.	It was mentioned in page 6	Method, page 6
(Reviewer 3)			
Abstract	• The abstract of the article does not require a search strategy.	Done.	Abstract, page 1.
	• The structure of abstract should obey the journal's guideline	Done.	Abstract, page 1.
	• In keywords: Organize keywords based on MESH system.	Done. Just “Supplier-induced Demand” is not in mesh system and because it’s an important keyword we don’t omit it.	Abstract, page 1.
Method	• You wrote the paper title “qualitative systematic review”, but did not mention it in the text. By the way, in “qualitative systematic review” you should find and analysis of qualitative primary studies, not all types of studies!!	It was corrected and mentioned in page 4	Method , Page 4
	• The question of the study is not very clear and it does not show necessity of using systematic method for answering it?	It was mentioned in page 4	Method, page 4
	• Describe the third step items (eligibility) of figure 1 in the precise text	Done.	Method, page 5
	How many persons participated in doing screening, select and extracting data and quality assessment? (Mention them and their expertise). What is your strategy for disagreement between persons?	It was corrected and mentioned in page 6	Method
	• Please mention inclusion and exclusion criteria for screening of primary studies clearly?	Done.	Pages 4 and 5
	• Have you evaluated all types (qualitative, analytical and descriptive-analytical) of studies based on a quality assessment tool? Add quality assessment table as the second table of the article.	It was added in page 6	Method, page 6.
	• Why the author has done this research in a local level? If this is important to you why not search all the Iranian databases (such as magiran, irandoc and …)?	It was searched and added in page 4	Method, page 4.
	• The study has highly severe heterogeneity. What is your strategy for this matter?	Done.	Method, pages 4 and 5.

	• What is your strategy for gray papers? Mention it clearly	Done.	Method, Page5.
Finding	• Correct number and tittle of tables (spatially table 1). Graphs and tables should be provided in accordance with the format and standards of systematic review studies.	Done	
	• This classification method of the factors affecting SID that is presented in (Table 1) is not already present in previous papers and studies?	No, but authors after studying the article choose this model for helping policy maker to address them.	
Discussion	• It is still vague what the benefit of doing such systematic review is and what gaps has it covered?	Done. (Identification of all factors affecting SID can be helpful in revising and reforming the country's health system. Therefore, it is necessary to find the right solutions to tackle this phenomenon in order to help the country to properly spend its resources in the health sector, to take a useful step to improve the efficient management of the health system, reduce the challenges between providers and buyers, control of Increasing health care costs in Iran and ultimately improving the quality of services to patients. Policy makers and health professionals may not have enough time to collect, evaluate and integrate all relevant literature. Systematic review fulfills this important task and answers such questions as are available to decision makers. In fact, the main purpose of this systematic reviews is improving decision making with recognizing different dimensions of SID.)	Context, page 4
Conclusion	• Strength points and limitations of the study are not mentioned. State clearly how you solved the limitations of the study. (In this article, only Persian and English articles were used, this is language bias. What is your solution to reduce this bias?)	Done.	Conclusion, page 12
	• The Conclusion appears weak and needs to be further strengthened with sharp messages	Done.	Conclusion, page 12
	• The manuscript suffers from a poor English (few spelling and grammatical errors). I recommend you to get it edit it by a native English speaker help	Done.	
References:	• Some of the used references are very old and so needs to be updated.	Done	
	• Please correct in accordance with the guidelines of journal	Done	

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.

Hossein Ansari: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 4 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
The authors have revised the manuscript based on the reviewers' comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 5 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
In spite of the fact that the manuscript has been edited and additional information was added, the minor revision is needed to improve grammaring. Any way, the document might be accepted for publication.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 5 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
The structure of the article and many of the requirements of the systematic review article have not been met. It seems best to choose the type of study as a comprehensive or simple review.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 14 Jan 2020

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 17 Jan 2020

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
Thanks.

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.

Reviewer	Reviewer comment(s)	Response	Locates of manuscript
(Reviewer 1)	*In spite of the fact that the manuscript has been edited and additional information was added, the minor revision is needed to improve grammaring. Anyway, the document might be accepted for publication.*	It's done. We've checked and improved the article grammatically.	**During the paper.**
(Reviewer 2)	*The structure of the article and many of the requirements of the systematic review article have not been met. It seems best to choose the type of study as a comprehensive or simple review*	It's done	**During the paper.**

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) 3 Mar 2020

Dear EIC,
The authors have revised the manuscript based on the reviewers' comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 16 Mar 2020

Dear author
The manuscript is based on the reviewers' comments. Accepted.
Thanks.