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

Hepatitis Monthly
Article DOI: 10.5812/hepatmon.113226
Published in: Hepatitis Monthly: 21(3); e113226

Peer Review Report for "A Two-Year Outcome Evaluation of Government-Led Initiative to Upscale Hospital-Based Hepatitis C Treatment Using a Standard Two-Drug Regimen in Malaysia"

Author(s): Huan-Keat Chan, Mohamed Azmi Hassali, Rosaida Md Said, Haniza Omar, Noor Aliza Abd Mutalib, Frederick Walter De Rozario, Muhammad Radzi Abu Hassan

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 24 Jan 2021
Revised Date: 16 Mar 2021
Accepted Date: 17 Mar 2021

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) 8 Mar 2021

Dear AE,

The article is properly titled, aptly reflecting its content. Its content focusing on a review of data on an important Malaysia health care initiative, the treatment of Hepatitis C.
The abstract submitted consisted of 345 words, it concisely reflected the paper content, accurately and adequately. There are 6 keywords : Hepatitis C, Treatment Outcome Malaysia, Sofosbuvir, Health Care Costs, Daclatasvir.
The introduction is clearly written. The background information of the subject is adequately provided. The objectives well are designed and aptly address the gap in knowledge.
This was a retrospective cohort study. The study design was described well. However, there was NO inclusion or exclusion criteria of sample given.
Results were presented in 4 tables and 1 figure. Results were recorded appropriately, using appropriate table. They were presented in logical manner and easy to follow. No unnecessary repetition of data between the tables and the written paragraph in the paper. Authors managed to emphasize important findings.

Discussion was mainly relevant. However, in one point presented by the author, comparing the number of patients receiving the DAA are higher that patients receiving IFN and ribavirin, there are no mention of the source of data or reference that supported this. References cited were fairly new, from the last 5 years.

Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 13 Mar 2021

Dear Editor,

The manuscript is interesting. But please look at the results, it needs more explanation systematically.
The manuscript can be accepted after revision.

Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 13 Mar 2021

Dear Editor in Chief
Thanks for assigning me as associate editor to handle the manuscript NO.113226 titled "A Two-Year Outcome Evaluation of Government-led Initiative to Upscale Hospital-Based Hepatitis C Treatment using a Standard Two-Drug Regimen in Malaysia"

The subject is timely and the study has a good design. Also, the manuscript is well-written. I appreciate the authors' work to collect these important data and to write such a good manuscript. I think the current version of manuscript is good enough to be published in our journal. See the reviewers' comments attached.

Regards
Associate editor

Seyed Moayed Alavian: EIC | **Revision** (0) 14 Mar 2021

Dear Authors,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript. Please consider the minor amendments suggested by the reviewers. I have few additional corrections:

1. There is discrepancy between dates included in Figure 1 (December 2019) and under the subheading "Status of Treatment Completion" (March 2020).

2. Please replace the current keywords by the MESH keywords.

3. Please blank the background of Figure 1.

Regards,

EIC

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.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR AND REVIEWER

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

We appreciate your time and efforts in reviewing this manuscript. All the corrections made in the manuscript and tables are highlighted in red. Besides, we have addressed all issues indicated in the review report as follows:

A. Comments of Reviewer 1

1. *The article is properly titled, aptly reflecting its content. Its content focusing on a review of data on an important Malaysia health care initiative, the treatment of Hepatitis C.*
   Response: Thank you for your positive comment.

2. *The abstract submitted consisted of 345 words, it concisely reflected the paper content, accurately and adequately. There are 6 keywords: Hepatitis C, Treatment Outcome Malaysia, Sofosbuvir, Health Care Costs, Daclatasvir.*
   Response: Thank you for your positive comment.

3. *The introduction is clearly written. The background information of the subject is adequately provided. The objectives well are designed and aptly address the gap in knowledge.*
   Response: Thank you for your positive comment.

4. *This was a retrospective cohort study. The study design was described well. However, there was NO inclusion or exclusion criteria of sample given.*
   Response: Eligibility criteria is added (page 3).

5. *Results were presented in 4 tables and 1 figure. Results were recorded appropriately, using appropriate table. They were presented in logical manner and easy to follow. No unnecessary repetition of data between the tables and the written paragraph in the paper. Authors managed to emphasize important findings.*
   Response: Thank you for your positive comment.

6. *Discussion was mainly relevant. However, in one point presented by the author, comparing the number of patients receiving the DAA are higher that patients*

receiving IFN and ribavirin, there are no mention of the source of data or reference that supported this.
Response: It is added that such a conclusion is drawn based on the record of the Ministry of Health, Malaysia (page 8).

7. *References cited were fairly new, from the last 5 years.*
Response: Thank you for your positive comment.

B. Comments of Reviewer 2

1. *The manuscript is interesting. But please look at the results, it needs more explanation systematically. The manuscript can be accepted after revision.*
Response: Thank you for the positive comment and recommendation for acceptance after revision. The result section is summarized mainly based on the 4 tables and 1 figure presented at the end of the manuscript. As commented by Reviewer 1, we highlighted only important findings. We would appreciate it if clarification could be given on which part of the findings requiring more explanation.

C. Comments of Associate Editor 1

1. *The subject is timely and the study has a good design. Also, the manuscript is well-written. I appreciate the authors' work to collect these important data and to write such a good manuscript. I think the current version of manuscript is good enough to be published in our journal. See the reviewers' comments attached.*
Response: Thank you for your positive comment.

D. Comments of EIC

1. *There is discrepancy between dates included in Figure 1 (December 2019) and under the subheading "Status of Treatment Completion" (March 2020).*
Response: Thank you for pointing out the discrepancy. Correction is made.

2. *Please replace the current keywords by the MESH keywords.*
Response: MESH keywords are added.

3. *Please blank the background of Figure 1.*
Response: The background of Figure 1 is blanked as requested.

We hope that we have successfully addressed all your comments. Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

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.

Seyed Moayed Alavian: EIC | **Revision** (**1**) 17 Mar 2021

Dear Authors,

I am delighted to inform that your manuscript is accepted for publication in Hepatitis Monthly.

Regards,
EIC