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.96868
Published in: Health Scope: 9(2); e96868

Peer Review Report for "Structural Equation Modeling to Explore the Relationship Between Organizational Culture Dimensions and Implementation of Knowledge Management in Teaching Hospitals"

Author(s): Ahmad Rahbar, Amir Ashkan Nasiripour, Mahmood Mahmoodi-Majdabadi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	3 Aug 2019
Revised Date:	7 Sep 2019
Accepted Date:	25 Oct 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)

14 Aug 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:
Abstract:
• In method, please report the amount of Content Validity Ratio and Cronbach's alpha coefficient.
• In keywords: Organize keywords based on MESH system.
Methods
• Present a reference (or references) to this sentence “According to a previous study, the minimum sample size for factor analysis was three to 20 fold the number of variables for each item of the questionnaire”.

• Was the study sample randomized? Be noted
• Why did you do “exploratory factor analysis”? You used the standard questionnaire so You had the dimensions of study you didn't need to do.
Result
• Table 1 data does not match the text. “from all subjects 66.7% were female and 62.6% were female”
• Please correct and complete the tables and Figure titles and Summarize Table 1.
• Use the LISREL output to present the final model of the research so that the obvious variables are also visible.
Discussion:
• Strength points and limitations of the study are not mentioned.
Conclusion:
• The Conclusion appears weak and needs to be further strengthened with sharp messages
• 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
References:
• Some of the used references are very old and so needs to be updated.
• Please correct in accordance with the guidelines of journal
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 18 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
- It is worth mentioning briefly the history of the subject in introduction.
- Explain how and when to collect the data.
- Describe more about the reasons for compliance or non-compliance with other studies.
- Please add limitation of the study.
- This suggestion is vague. Please provide more definite ones.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 24 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
- Abstract: in result, section write mean score of KM and Organizational Culture
- Abstract: write a conclusion based on the results
- Used of the following paper for improving quality of introduction:
"Relationship Between Knowledge Management and Quality of Working Life in Nursing Staff of Zahedan Teaching Hospitals, 2014 "
"MODELING CUSTOMER RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT PATTERN USING HUMAN FACTORS APPROACH IN THE HOSPITALS OF TEHRAN UNIVERSITY OF MEDICAL SCIENCES"
- If the participants completed Consent Form? Write in the method section
- Specify the tables in the text
- Write the code of project in acknowledgement section
Regards,

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 24 Aug 2019

Dear EIC,
The manuscript titled: Structural Equation Modeling to exploring the Relationship between Organizational Culture Dimensions and Implementation of Knowledge Management in Teaching Hospitals needs minor revision.
Regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 26 Aug 2019

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
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.

Response to the Reviewers		
Corrective actions	REVIEWERS' COMMENTS	
Response to the reviewer-1	Reviewer-1	
It was corrected in lines: 36-39	**Background:** It is worth mentioning briefly the history of the subject in introduction.	1
It was corrected in lines: 102-104	**Methods:** Explain how and when to collect the data.	2
It was corrected in lines:200-203 &213-216&218-221&227-230.	**Discussion:** Describe more about the reasons for compliance or non-compliance with other studies.	3
It was corrected in lines:241-247	**Discussion:** Please add limitation of the study.	4
It was corrected in lines:259-263	**Conclusion:** This suggestion is vague. Please provide more definite ones.	5
Response to the reviewer-2	Reviewer- 2	6
It was corrected in lines:18-19	**Abstract/ Result:** in result section write mean score of KM and Organizational Culture	7
Modified after correcting previous comment.	**Abstract/ Conclusion:** write conclusion based on the results	8
Reference numbers 1 and 7 were added.	**Background & Result:** Used of the following paper for improving quality of introduction: "Relationship Between Knowledge Management and Quality of Working Life in Nursing Staff of Zahedan Teaching Hospitals, 2014 " "MODELING CUSTOMER RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT PATTERN USING HUMAN FACTORS APPROACH IN THE HOSPITALS OF TEHRAN UNIVERSITY OF MEDICAL SCIENCES"	9
It was corrected in lines:100-101	**Methods:** If the participants completed Consent Form? Write in method section	10
It was corrected in lines:131-136-141-146-149-150-155.	**Result:** Specify the tables in text	11
It was corrected in lines:268-270.	**Acknowledgement:** Write the code of project in acknowledgement section	12

Response to the reviewer-3	Reviewer- 3	13
It was corrected in lines:12-14	**Abstract, In method:** please report the amount of Content Validity Ratio and Cronbach's alpha coefficient.	14
It was corrected in lines:31 Controlled and corrections were made.	**Abstract: In keywords:** Organize keywords based on MESH system. Methods	15
It was corrected in lines:89-90 Reference Number:21-22	**Methods:** * Present a reference (or references) to this sentence "According to a previous study, the minimum sample size for factor analysis was three to 20 fold the number of variables for each item of the questionnaire".	16
It was corrected in lines:95-96 &98-100 The proportional stratified sampling method was used for selecting eligible participants. Samples were selected by simple randomized sampling method from the list prepared by the administration department and also based on inclusion and exclusion criteria.	**Methods:** Was the study sample randomized? Be noted	17
It was corrected in lines:105 &111&116-117 The measurement instruments were created based on literature review and using a **adapted from** of KM and OC instruments, based on Gold index and Hurly, Islam. On the other hand, we did not used the original questionnaire of Gold index (2001) and Hurly, Islam, respectively. Therefore, we standardized the questionnaire and the reliability and validity of tool reassessed.	**Methods:** Why did you do "exploratory factor analysis"? You used the standard questionnaire so You had the dimensions of study you didn't need to do.	18
It was corrected in lines: it is revised in line 128.	**Result:** * Table 1 data does not match the text. "from all subjects 66.7% were female and 62.6% were female"	19
Title of tables and figure 1 &2&3&4 are corrected. And table 1 was summarize .	**Result:** * Please correct and complete the tables and Figure titles and Summarize Table 1.	20

It was corrected in figures 1 and 2	**Result:** * Use the LISREL output to present the final model of the research so that the obvious variables are also visible	21
It was corrected in lines:239-246	**Discussion:** * Strength points and limitations of the study are not mentioned	22
It was corrected in lines:252-263	**Conclusion:** * The Conclusion appears weak and needs to be further strengthened with sharp messages	23
This manuscript is edited professionally by KOSAR Company. Moreover, this revised manuscript was also edited by an English expert.	**Conclusion:** 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.	24
It was corrected and replace with new references.NO:**25and 27**	**References:** * Some of the used references are very old and so needs to be updated. References: * Please correct in accordance with the guidelines of journal	25

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) 21 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
The manuscript is changed according to previous comments and now it is suitable for publication.
Best Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 21 Oct 2019

Dear EIC,
The manuscript entitled: Structural Equation Modeling to Exploring the Relationship between Organizational Culture Dimensions and Implementation of Knowledge Management in Teaching Hospitals, has been revised based on the reviewers' comments and it could be published in the Health Scope journal.
Best,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 25 Oct 2019

Dear author
The manuscript entitled: Structural Equation Modeling to Exploring the Relationship between Organizational Culture Dimensions and Implementation of Knowledge Management in Teaching Hospitals, was accepted for publication in the Health Scope journal.
Thanks.